













# TRIAMOIRAI ;

OR

A PUBLICATION CONSISTING OF THREE PARTS :

*THE FIRST,*

ADDRESSED

TO THE ROMAN CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

*THE SECOND*

TO THE PROTESTANT CLERGY OF IRELAND;

AND

*THE THIRD*

TO THE KING AND HIS MINISTERS,

UPON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH

THE RELIGION OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

---

*I speak as to wise men ; judge ye what I say.—1 COR. x. 15.*

---

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY M. GOODWIN, 29, DENMARK-STREET.

And sold by

R. MILLIKEN, GRAFTON-STREET, C. P. ARCHER, DAME-STREET, M. KEENE, COLLEGE  
GREEN, ANNE WATSON, CAPEL-STREET, R. TIMS, GRAFTON-STREET, AND  
SEVERAL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

---

Price 2s. 6d.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CHICAGO, ILL.

DECEMBER 10, 1900

TO

THE PRESIDENT

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

FROM

THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CHICAGO, ILL.

DECEMBER 10, 1900



## PREFACE.

---

THE writer of the few following pages intended to have had them completed several weeks since—but was prevented, by the interference of other unavoidable engagements.

If the name by which they are called, should lead persons of learning to suppose they contain any thing particularly intended for them, it is not the case. The name was fixed on merely as a matter of convenience, and if it have any pretension to learning, it is almost the only thing connected with the publication which has a similar claim.

Learning in Roman Catholic controversy is often useful—but the writer is far from thinking it always necessary. What is untrue to-day, was untrue yesterday, and will be so for ever: his own weapon has been chiefly the Bible, and whether he have been enabled to handle it skilfully or not, he submits to an indulgent public again to judge.

With the Bible, the veriest child in the community is able to put all the Roman Catholic priests and prelates in the world to flight. It is a light they cannot stand before; a light they have always laboured to extinguish; and a light will finally dissipate their melancholy system of darkness and of death; a light Satan dreads; and a light, whoever obstructs or opposes the circulation of, is, without palliation or excuse, his active and his zealous agent.

The notes annexed to this publication I have taken the liberty of placing at the end, the mode usually adopted in larger works: some of them, by being there, persons have an opportunity of reading or not, as pleasure or convenience may dispose them—but for the concluding one, P, I cannot yield to this exception; on the contrary, earnestly recommend it to the reader's most serious attention. If it or other parts of the publication contain any thing of a useful tendency, my only desire is, that He from whom it proceeded may get the exclusive praise. Whatever is good is his—all that's bad is mine.

The slight observations which the reader will meet with as he proceeds, upon the subject of Maynooth College, and the existence of the Roman Catholic religion being the cause of the hitherto degraded state of Ireland, will, I hope induce persons, particularly political economists, to examine how far Maynooth, and other similar institutions for the education of popish clergy, have been instrumental in producing the wretched state of this country, which, I confess I sometimes cannot help smiling, when I see the curious speculations of many people to discover the cause of. Let any persons look at what kind of men the popish clergy are, the places they are educated in, and the education they receive, together with the nature of their religion, and the subjection under which they hold so large a portion of the population of this country, and I say if it did not present the aspect it does, it would be a wonder, the ordinary nature of things would be insufficient to account for; and this will hold good in a fair comparison, between any Protestant and Roman Catholic districts or countries in Europe; and I will venture to say, that if England, even with all its present superiority and advantage, had as many popish clergy in proportion, scattered over the face of it as Ireland has, with any thing approaching to similar means for their operation, she would soon descend from her present eminence, and sink into moral and political degradation; and the reason is clear; any system which destroys freedom of judgment and will, and brings men under an abject subjection to superstition and ignorance, in the natural progress of cause and effect, must produce this result. It often surprises me too, that of the number of persons who are disposed to be clamorous against tithe in Ireland, none appear willing to say a word upon the enormous sum popish clergy annually receive. Besides the titular bishops, and an immense number of inferior clergy, who must be all paid, and many of them well, there are about one thousand parish priests in Ireland, and their incomes, taking in the North, where they are less, run perhaps upon an average, from £200 to £500 a year, which at the medium, £350, amounts to the enormous sum of £350,000 annually; and if it be considered what description of persons this is chiefly dragged from, and the value they receive in return, I only repeat again, if Ireland presented any other aspect than it does, it would be a wonder, something more than the ordinary nature of things could account for. In fact, the extortion of the popish clergy under various pre-

tences, is often carried so far, as to cause considerable discontent, so that in one case in the South of Ireland, lately much disturbed, with which the writer is acquainted, and he believes it only one amongst many, the wretched peasantry were so oppressed, that they called upon the gentlemen of the country to interfere in their behalf; and I advert to these circumstances for two reasons; one, as partly bearing upon the general object in view, and the other, to furnish a slight ground-work for any person who may feel disposed to bring the subject before the public, in a more particular and enlarged form.

With reference to the immediate object of the Second Part of this publication, as well as for the further opportunity of saying a word to all to whom the observations may apply; I beg leave to make a few remarks upon what, further on, has been called the *mistaken* view which many persons take with regard to the nature of the Roman Catholic religion. Their view is, that it is only a system comprising some errors upon the subject of religion, in common with other errors which prevail in a similar way; and though they may perhaps be in several respects worse than many of their companions, yet that they should not be spoken against in the manner they so frequently are; and that by kindness and conciliation to Roman Catholics, their prejudices will gradually soften down, and the errors of their religion give way to light and truth; and hence it is, that the reiteration of this plausible view, has disposed a great number of well-meaning persons to consider it a duty to be silent with regard to the peculiar errors of popish faith, and to endeavour rather if possible, to unite, and amalgamate contending opinions, than that one should be set in any thing like continued opposition to the other. Kindness and tenderness to all men, as men and fellow-creatures, I hold to be the bounden, indispensable duty of every man, as a member of social and of civil life, and as a rational and finally accountable agent—but if we abuse this principle to a departure from duty in other respects, we can neither have the favour or the blessing of Him, “in whom we live and move.” Popery is not a system with a certain quantum of bad so mixed through its good, that it is capable of a process of purification, by letting the one pass through, and only retaining the other. No; it is the child of the Devil; he is the father and the author of it; it is, as mentioned more moderately in this work, the grand Antichristian system he has set up in

the world to oppose, and if possible finally overthrow the religion of Christ; it is invariably marked in the Bible under this character. More than 2000 years ago, in the Old Testament, it was adverted to, as such. The same is repeated in the New. The Pope is "the man of sin, the son of perdition, whom God is to consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming." The Apostle calls the religion "the doctrine of devils," and gives its mark so distinctly, that even Roman Catholics themselves cannot deny the exclusive application of the character. Again, it is described, as "the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit," it has a certain time allowed for its existence. It has been the most prolific source of sin that ever existed upon earth, and finally, it will retain its errors, and "blaspheme the God of heaven," even to the latest period of its signal destruction. Rev. xvi. 10, 11. Hence Christians have but one, clear, broad line of duty to act on with regard to it, which is, that of "witnesses, witnesses clothed in sack-cloth," Rev. xi. 3. and while they should bear testimony on the one hand against its evils, and declare on the authority of God's word its final doom; they should also perseveringly and affectionately repeat his words, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues," Rev. xviii. 4. and if professing Christians do not act thus, the neglect of the former necessarily involves an omission of the latter; and the distinction God has made, being in consequence overlooked, it proves a mode of procedure different from what He has declared agreeable to his will; and if this view of things should appear just, to any who have been led into the error, the writer humbly hopes it may induce them, particularly Ministers, to consider the subject again, and to seek out opportunity for shaping their labours accordingly.

As the engagements already mentioned, which delayed this publication, chiefly occurred between the times of my writing the Third Part, and the concluding note to which it refers, together with the Preface, the progress of the present bill relating to Roman Catholics since introduced, and noted in the latter, leaves little hope that the former will meet such a measure of attention as to be productive of any practical good. Indeed, independently of this, I am free to confess, little hope of that kind could reasonably be entertained, from the leaning there has been for some time past, to Catholic

opinions and to Catholic measures; a leaning, which has made men almost afraid to speak out; and has branded with the names of bigotry and intolerance, the only true friends of the constitution in church and state; a leaning, which is now hurrying a measure through a British House of Commons, which, if there be truth in the book of God, will before long, cover the names of its movers and abettors with infamy and reproach; a measure that once done, who will undo? a measure justified upon no one sound principle of policy, of prudence, or necessity; that wantonly violates the constitution, and risks every thing, without even a moderately rational prospect of gaining any thing; a measure that will revive old times; that will open up our former intercourse with Rome; that will make the "seat of the beast" and all his worshippers rejoice; and that will influence them to put every part of their infernal machinery in motion, to bring England again, if possible, prostrate before the chair of "the son of perdition," 2 Thess. ii. 3. and however weak this may appear to some, I can tell them they are ignorant of facts, and that popery has been long sapping and mining in order to attain the object, and that in consequence, its increase in England within the past twenty or five-and-twenty years has been frightful, both as to chapels and professors of its system: the present number of the former is estimated at nine hundred, and the latter at three hundred thousand! and considering popery to be what it really is, the religion of the "natural man," a religion that will send men to heaven, let them live as they please;—if those chapels and professors be lifted from their obscurity, and brought into credit and repute, who will venture to say what their increase may not be, within perhaps a shorter space than would be either anticipated or believed? The very bill, however, itself carries its own refutation on the face of it, for the only reason it assigns for its introduction is, that the necessity of the exclusion it is intended to remove, no longer exists—an assertion the framers of the bill could not attempt to prove; an assertion instances innumerable could be brought forward to contradict; an assertion the aspect of things in Europe, and the present state of this country, consigns to untruth; and an assertion the very nature of popery, in order to its being what it is, incontrovertibly denies; and sorry I am to see, that out of the two hundred and forty-four members who voted against it, there was not one found to follow that talented and estimable gentleman, the Right Hon. the Secretary

for the Home Department, in arguing against the measure upon principle, and upon principle only. It is easy to talk of Elizabeth, and James, and Charles, and the Revolution, and to play upon men's ears by such materials, thrown into captivating eloquence, and well-regulated periods—but the Divine law is the basis upon which all human legislation should be founded, and upon the basis of that law, I contend for it, if every vestige of such history were removed from existence, and even the remembrance of its contents obliterated from the mind, with the view the Bible gives us of popery, the professors of that religion should not be permitted to take part in the legislation of any constitution framed as the British wisely is; and in consequence I inter, that none except those who are either *ignorant or careless* concerning that view, would support a contrary measure, and that if one, or both, had not much to do in the concerns of the state, it never would have gone the alarming length it has. But as its next step will be the House of Lords, if these few pages should meet any of the eyes of the noble personages who compose that honorable assembly, before the final discussion of the measure, I solemnly call upon them to pause, and in the name of every thing that is sacred, every thing that is dear, and every thing that is valuable in the country, to consider what it is they are going to part with, and what they can substantially expect to receive; and if the view we humbly present at the conclusion of this pamphlet, be founded in consistency and truth, to beware how they give so much additional power to an enemy, whom God has expressly told us, will shortly rise against his people and his church.

Persons who look tamely at this subject, from their not being aware of the dangers with which it is pregnant, might be disposed to say here, "What harm can there be in admitting ten or a dozen Roman Catholic peers into the House of Lords, even supposing the measure to be accompanied with some reasonable grounds for alarm? They are few, and can do but little injury." I answer, their fewness is no argument against the step. The man who steals a hundred pounds, is as much a thief as the man who steals five thousand. It is the principle of the thing, the principle of the thing; there the moral impropriety lies—but in addition to this, as already remarked, it violates the constitution; and if Roman Catholic peers are to be admitted into the House of Lords, and the safeguards which our good forefathers

erected are to be rudely torn away, consistency, common courtesy, would require, that the House of Commons should be open to men of a similar profession; and this done, what is the consequence? You elevate "the beast" to honor and distinction; you bring it into the court, the levee, and the drawing-room; you make it unfashionable and rude to talk against principles; thus marked with confidence, and loaded with favor; you throw difficulties in the way of the "witnesses;" you oblige them in addition to the duties of their previous testimony, to combat with fashion, with popular opinion, and with the very approbation of the state to which they in some measure look for safety and protection. How can a minister, clothed with the sacred habits the established religion of his country puts upon him, step into the pulpit, and in faithful obedience to the oracles of God, lift his voice against the impiety of the mass, the evils of confession, of penance, of tradition, of purgatory, of extreme unction, of the eucharist, of holy water, of the supremacy of the pope, of the invalidity of councils, of saint worship and image worship, and all the hideous tissue of idolatry which marks the constitution and the character of popery? How, I say, can a Minister do all this: when men of rank, of influence, and of fortune, avowing, and who have long publicly avowed their belief of these principles, sit in judgment and in legislation upon him? It would be a contradiction not to be looked at; a contradiction, and let my words be marked, that will either inevitably overrun Britain with popery, or produce an awful revolution in the country; and what moreover may not be dreaded, if some of these popish lords and commoners, filled with grief at the fallen greatness of their church, as they call it, of artful and insinuating manners, with Jesuit confessors living in their houses, and dining at their tables, should set themselves to spread the poison of their system, to diffuse their subtle influence around, and perhaps to gain the ear of our good, our kind, and our gracious King, already hastening to the period of "three score years and ten;" what, I say, if all this were to take place? And who will venture to say, from the history of the past, from the aspect of the present, and the prospect of the future, that such may not, nay, that such in nine probabilities out of ten, would not be the case? And in the face of these likelihoods, I raise my humble voice. I sound a loud and a thrilling alarm, and if it should ever reach the shores of England, or reach them in time to effect

any little good, I say, Inhabitants of Britain, inhabitants of Britain, stop if possible this ruinous measure. 'Tis one, and most probably the chief leading to the persecution we call your attention to. 'Tis from beneath, and pregnant with calamity. Already, yea already; we can tell you popery begins to ridicule your weakness, and to laugh at your credulity; to smile at the success of its deception, and rejoice at the prospect of its approaching ascendancy.

“*Talibus insidiis, perjurique arte Sinonis,  
Credita res: captique dolis, lacrymisque coacti,  
Quos neque Tydides, nec Larissæus Achilles,  
Non anni domuere decem, non mille carinæ.*”

If the Bible be from Heaven, if it contain the message of the Most High, rouse, O rouse, we beseech you, and ponder, at least a little, on what God peradventure has revealed. Your security requires it; your interest demands it; and again the humble individual who addresses you exclaims, Inhabitants of Britain, inhabitants of Britain, be determined while you have it in your power, peaceably to preserve your constitution, your liberty, and your church.



## *FIRST PART.*

---

TO THE

## **ROMAN CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.**

---

SUCH of you, respected friends, as have seen a small publication, entitled, "a Correspondence between a Roman Catholic Priest and a Protestant Layman," may recollect that, amongst other articles, there was subjoined to the publication "A challenge to the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland to come forward, if they were able, and answer the arguments brought against them:" and as a sufficient length of time has elapsed for the purpose of completing an answer, without any such having appeared, I feel myself called upon to redeem the pledge connected with the challenge, that if your Clergy did not come forward, "the nation should be told they did not, because they could not." And as my doing so furnishes me with an opportunity of addressing you again, I cannot let it pass without entering, for a little, into a discussion upon a few subjects, which it may not be altogether useless to have brought before you, in what appears to me their true point of light. The subjects particularly alluded to, are,

*The Virgin Mary and Transubstantiation.*

One of these has been already adverted to in the Corre-

spondence, the other has not; and I select them for discussion at present, not that they are more untrue than most of the other doctrines peculiar to the Roman Catholic religion; but because they seem, in a great measure, to form the ground-work of that dreadful system of idolatry, which is so connected with the Church of Rome, that it is impossible to view her in any way without perceiving; and which seems to have its completion in the suppression of the second commandment from her catechism. To those two I will also add,

*A condensed view of the Nature of the Roman Catholic Religion, and some remarks relative to the discipline pursued in Maynooth College.*

As the order thus marked places last, the immediate subject from which this publication takes its rise, we shall commence with the Virgin Mary, and divide our view of that subject into the following parts:

First, *Mary did not continue Virgin after the birth of our Lord.*

Secondly, *She was a Sinner.*

Thirdly, *Our Lord's manner towards her does not lead us to suppose she was what Roman Catholics say, but the reverse.*

Fourthly, *The doctrines of her purity, and perpetual virginity, originated with ignorant and carnal minds; and*

Fifthly, *That the Roman Catholic representation of her, is in its consequences, subversive of the fundamental principles of the religion of Christ.*

First, *Mary did not continue virgin after the birth of our Lord.*

It is more a matter of surprise that any person, acknowledging the scriptures to be a revelation from God, should believe this doctrine, than that others should be found to

advance it. And how will Roman Catholics account for their inconsistency in this respect, when the following passages occur in the very first chapter of the New Testament? "Now, the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: when as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, (or, as we would express it, a humane man) and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." And, in the two concluding verses of the chapter it continues: "Then Joseph, being raised from sleep, *did* as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife; and *knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son*: and he called his name Jesus." If we are not, from this part of scripture, plainly to understand that Joseph and Mary, after the birth of our Lord, lived together in the ordinary way of man and wife—no one truth, taught by the Christian religion, can be proved from the Bible ||. And if this fact be taken in connexion with an expression of "the brethren and sisters" of our Lord, which not unfrequently occurs in the Bible, we may reasonably, perhaps unquestionably infer, that after the birth of the Redeemer, Joseph and Mary begot and brought up several children.

Secondly, *Mary was a Sinner.*

According to the religious knowledge which existed amongst the Jews, at the time of our Lord's coming into

---

|| In the Rhemish Testament there is a note on this place, which if any persons be at the trouble of looking at, and also turning to the passages of scripture referred to, they will find the note to be an unjust, and very unsuccessful attempt, to explain away what should not be denied.

the world, we have the fullest reason for believing Mary was a pious woman; this is clearly evinced by the account given in the Bible of her demeanor, at the time the angel informed her of the miraculous conception which was about to take place; but that she was free from sin, or even superior to any who lived in her day, are facts which nearly every circumstance of her life indisputably contradict. In our ignorant and darkened state through the fall, we can form a very imperfect conception of what a person is who is without sin; or, what we ourselves would be, were we in that state; but we can know so much of it as clearly to perceive, that it was impossible for Mary to be perfect, and manifest the ignorance it appears she did, at times, respecting the character of Christ. Towards the conclusion of the second chapter of Luke, when an account is given of our Lord having remained "in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors," Mary is described as asking him why he did not proceed along with herself and his father, who had sought him sorrowing? He replied, by asking in return, how it was they did not know that he must be about his Father's business? When it is remarked, neither she or Joseph "understood the saying which he spake unto them," how could such be, if Mary were not a sinner? Bearing this ignorance in mind—whoever refers to the five last verses of the third chapter of Mark, and compares them with the twenty-first verse of the same chapter, may perceive there is good reason for supposing, that Mary was amongst the friends who went out to lay hold on Jesus, thinking he was beside himself, as she is named amongst them, as having come to execute their purpose, in the thirty-first verse: not that we are to believe she went so far in the view of our blessed Lord's supposed derangement, as others of his relations seemed to do—or, possibly, even concurred with them at all in that respect; but we know a well-meaning woman, on particular occasions might, through much affection, be led to fear that her child was endangering his personal safety, from a zeal in religious

matters, beyond what, in her view, appeared justifiable by prudence or necessity. But were it not for the purpose of shewing, in what a variety of ways this part of our subject may be proved from scripture, one argument which remains would have been sufficient, and that is, Mary's own confession of the fact, when she meets Elizabeth, in Luke the 1st and 46th, &c. what she said upon that occasion is related, it commences by "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my *Saviour*:" now upon what principle, let Roman Catholics tell, could God be her *Saviour*, if she had no sins to be saved from?

Thirdly, *Our Lord's manner towards Mary does not lead us to suppose she was what Roman Catholics say—but the reverse.*

In the consideration of this part of our subject, it may not be amiss to remark, that whatever is necessary to bring forward in proof of it, no person should construe into our blessed Lord not having the tenderest regard and affection for his mother: as perfect man, he was no doubt, perfect in that as well as in every other respect; and a striking proof of it appears in his directing his attention towards her welfare, at a time when his sufferings were acute and agonizing beyond description; on the cross he said to the disciple John, with reference to Mary, "Behold thy mother;" and to his mother, "Behold thy son;" and from that hour, it is stated, John took Mary to his own home. John xix. 27. The expression, however, even here, which our Lord makes use of when he addresses John, is not a little remarkable; it is not *my* mother—but *thy* mother; and invariably through the gospels the same strain will be observed; for, while our Lord, as man, was Mary's son, as Christ he was Mary's God.

The first part of the New Testament which we shall advert to as bearing immediately on the subject, is the 2d of John, where our Lord, at the marriage of Cana in Galilee,

turned the water into wine; when Mary applies to him on that occasion, his reply is, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" and if she had been what Roman Catholics say, surely he would not have made such an answer as this! || Again, in a similar passage to the one already referred to, and which was quoted in the Correspondence, the five last verses of the 12th of Matthew, where our Lord was told that "his mother and his brethren stood without desiring to speak with him," what was his answer? did it imply a mark of immediate, or even distant attention to his mother, or any acknowledgment of her superiority? No—but every thing the contrary, for "he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, and said, "Behold my *mother* and my brethren; for whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and *mother*." And it is a remarkable fact, that when many other important circumstances, connected with the history of our Lord's life, are related in but one of the gospels, this is mentioned in three out of the four; as if it were intended by the Holy Spirit, to give this unanswerable confutation of a dreadfully heretical doctrine, a prominently superior place in his blessed word. Again, in the 11th of Luke and 27th and 28th verses, our Lord is described as being surrounded by a great number of persons, many of whom were filled with astonishment at his appearance and wonderful works, when a woman in the company, under a strong impulse of feeling, lifted up her voice and said, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked." And surely if one circumstance more than another occurred which seemed to claim an acknowledgment from the Saviour of Mary's superiority, if any such existed, it was this; yet, what does he say to the woman's exclamation? "Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." When persons have such facts as these brought before them in the

Bible, it is not surprising that Roman Catholics, who endeavour to maintain doctrines which they contradict, should be anxious to prevent the circulation of that unspeakably blessed book.

Fourthly, *The doctrine of Mary's purity and perpetual virginity, originated with ignorant and carnal minds.*

In point of fact there is an unavoidably necessary connexion between our Lord's conception in the womb and Mary's previous virginity; and consequently upon that the scriptures leave nothing to doubt—but there is no necessary connexion whatever between his conception and Mary's subsequent virginity, or her previous and subsequent freedom from sin; on the contrary, the reverse is the case, as it is hoped, by and by, will be proved. When we consider that man, as far as concerns his mere animal nature, is nothing more than a structure formed by Divine workmanship from the dust of the earth; and that Christ, when he mercifully condescended to take upon him our nature, and dwell for a little in one of those structures formed by his own hand, it is an ignorant and carnal idea to suppose that the person of Mary, which constituted that structure, and that our Lord saw fit to choose for himself, either before or after his conception was necessarily, in any material way, different from other persons similarly constructed then or since.

*Ignorant*, with reference to her purity—

Because it unites two things, which in scripture, or reason, have no necessary connexion.

And *Carnal*, with reference to her subsequent virginity—

Because there is an association with the idea of something impure, in the lawful exercise of marriage rights, which a well-ordered mind will see nothing impure in.

As our Lord's conception was altogether miraculous, the

womb and body of Mary, may in a great measure be considered, if I may so call it, the casement in which our Lord, in a state of infancy, was deposited; and Roman Catholics have no more reason for saying, that that casement was essentially different from all other casements which existed in its day—than other persons would have, did they maintain so ridiculous a doctrine, that the stable in which our Lord was born, was superior to any other stable existing in Bethlehem at the time: or, that the manger in which he was laid, was not composed of the ordinary materials of all other mangers; or that neither was afterwards used for the common purposes to which all stables and mangers are applied ||.

*Fifthly, That the Roman Catholic representation of Mary, is in its consequences, subversive of the fundamental principles of the religion of Christ.*

As many of the remarks made already in that part of the Correspondence which treats of the Virgin Mary, bear, in a great measure, upon this division of the subject, we beg leave to refer to the publication; repeating again, that one of the chief sources of our blessed Lord's glory, in the character of Redeemer, proceeds from his humiliation, at which the Catholic doctrine, with respect to Mary, aims a deadly blow.

The two leading subjects, in which the religion of Christ seems principally to consist, and which will exist when others have ceased to operate, are, mercy on the part of God, and obligation on the part of man: it is this that will swell the song of everlasting praise in a world of purity and of peace, for ever and for ever. Now there is no person whatever, who must not perceive that this mercy and this obligation are considerably lessened, if we take from the humiliating circumstance of our Lord's incarnation in the womb of Mary.



The foundation of those pleasing reflections, which often fill the breasts of poor sinners with grateful feelings of admiration and of love, is overturned by this imaginary honor, intended for Him to whom all praise and all honor is due—we may illustrate this by a circumstance: suppose a man of an exceedingly kind disposition, who lived in great elegance and splendor, and had some favorite benevolent object in view, to accomplish which, he was obliged to lay aside his dignity, to leave his elegance and comfort, and to take up his abode in a miserable hut, surrounded with smoke and every inconvenience—would not the credit of that man's achievement be in a great measure destroyed, in the minds of those who were benefitted by his goodness, if any person, from a supposed regard to his rank in life, were to prevail on them to believe, that it was not a hut their benefactor dwelt in, but a large spacious house, the very best in the kingdom, and quite suited to a person of his exalted description? Assuredly it would. Just so is the attempt made to wound the honor of our adorable Saviour.

Reader, it is a false report—Christ, from his conception to the cross, was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief: for you, even for you, he condescended to become flesh, in the womb of a weak and of a mortal woman. Believe it and be thankful. Mary was a sinner by birth and practice—the Bible says so, reason corroborates the testimony; and He, to whom you owe your salvation and your all, is dishonored in his character, and injured in his glory, if you deny the fact.

For the information of such persons, as may not be acquainted with the length to which Roman Catholics go with regard to the Virgin Mary, we shall advert for a moment or two, to the manner in which she is brought forward in their prayer-books. There, in the course of worship, Mary in many places, is made much more prominently an object of

supplication than the Divine Being: and prayers are composed for her service which cannot without the grossest idolatry, be offered to any but God. Indeed prayers to her, or any saint, whether direct, or merely for intercession, put the person to whom they are addressed in God's place: as to render them at all available, there must be a pre-supposition, that that person is capable of knowing the thoughts of the heart, which God only can know. In "the Litany of the blessed virgin," as it is called, the following prayers occur, amongst many others of a similar kind, which it would be too tedious to transcribe || :

" Holy Mary,  
 Holy Mother of God,  
 Holy Virgin of Virgins,  
 Daughter of the Eternal Father,  
 Mother of the Eternal Son,  
 Spouse of the Eternal Spirit,  
 Tabernacle of the glorious Tri-  
 nity,  
 Mother of the Creator,  
 Mother of our Saviour,  
 Mother and Virgin,  
 Virgin most mild and clement,  
 Virgin most miraculously fruit-  
 ful,  
 Ever Virgin,  
 Root of the tree of life,  
 Source of the fountain of grace,

Orient to the sun of glory,  
 Mirror of humility and obedi-  
 ence,  
 Mirror of patience and resigna-  
 tion,  
 Mirror of faith, hope and cha-  
 rity,  
 Mirror of all virtues,  
 Refuge of sinners,  
 Comfort of the afflicted,  
 Advocate of all Christians,  
 Queen of patriarchs, prophets,  
 and apostles,  
 Queen of martyrs, confessors,  
 and virgins,  
 Queen of all saints,"

Pray for us

" O Holy Mary, Mother of God, and gracious Virgin, the true comfortress of all afflicted persons crying to thee, by that great joy wherewith thou wert comforted, when thou didst know our Lord Jesus was gloriously risen from death the third day, be a comfort to my soul, and vouchsafe to.

---

|| Any one, disposed to see more of the service, can refer to a Roman Catholic prayer-book for the purpose: the one most commonly used in chapels is called, "The Key of Paradise;" also mentioned as "opening the gate to eternal salvation."

help me with thine and God's only Son, in that last day, when I shall rise again with body and soul, and must give account of all my actions: to the end I may be able *by thee*, O pious Mother and Virgin! to avoid the sentence of perpetual damnation, and happily come to eternal joys, with all the elect of God. Amen."

In the right performance of the Rosary, which is a most material service in Roman Catholic devotion, great spiritual benefits are promised. The service, it is stated in the prayer-book, is so called, "because it is, as it were, a chaplet of spiritual roses; that is, of most sweet and devout prayers." It consists of fifteen *Pater nosters*, and one hundred and fifty *Ave Marias*.

Many Roman Catholics are in the daily habit of going through this performance; and more ignorant ones, in order to assist them reckoning correctly, have a string of beads, which they progressively move from one end of the string to the other, and every eleventh bead, which is of a larger size than the rest, marks their arrival at a *Pater noster*.

Only imagine, Reader, what a service this is! and how many hundreds of our poor countrymen are deluded, by being taught to look upon it all as a solemn exercise of Christian worship.

The next subject we proposed to consider was,

*Transubstantiation;*

And, for my own part, I am inclined to believe that if the doctrine had no ulterior reference, the best mode of treating it would be something in the way it is done in the "Tale of the Tub," where two of the three brothers, represented there, are invited to dinner by the third, and turned afterwards out of doors, because they refused to acknowledge a hard crust, served them for dinner, to be an

excellent shoulder of mutton—but the reference to which we advert is of so important a kind, that the topic itself, however absurd, should rather excite seriousness than ridicule; when we only think how far, through the power of sin, the human mind may be influenced in giving credit to religious, or rather irreligious falsehood and delusion; for certainly if there be any thing surprising connected with the doctrine of transubstantiation, it is not in the doctrine itself, but in the fact of persons being found to believe it: with this in view, we shall endeavour to examine it under the following heads:

*First, Transubstantiation cannot be true, because it is contrary to scripture.*

*Secondly, It cannot be true, because it is opposed to reason and sense, and consequently a breach of duty to believe it.*

*Thirdly, It cannot be true, because its effect is to do away the institution it pretends to perpetuate, and to substitute something else in its place.*

*First, Transubstantiation cannot be true, because it is contrary to scripture.*

The chief, if not the only reason, Roman Catholics assign for maintaining the doctrine, is the circumstance of our Lord, when he instituted the last-supper, saying, “take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you.” And, say they, when Christ said it was his body, must it not really be so?—but, if we are to take an expression of this kind literally, any person at all acquainted with the Scriptures, must perceive, that to do it in one case it should be done in all, and the consequence would be, to reduce many parts of the Bible to an absolute absurdity: and if it be asserted it is wrong to do it in every one but one, why not wrong, I ask, to do it in that one? and upon what principle will a Roman Catholic assume the bread to be the real body of Christ, because he says, “this is my body;” when,

taking the same mode of speech literally, in other expressions of our Lord, would unavoidably make him speak untruth? For instance, when he says, "this is my body," he also says, "this cup is the New Testament,"—but was the cup the New Testament? To multiply passages, where our Lord speaks in a similar way, would be quite unnecessary; any person looking at the New Testament will see many such as—"I *am* the door;" "I *am* the vine;" "my Father *is* the husbandman;" "ye *are* the branches;" "the field *is* the world;" "the reapers *are* the angels;" in short, a great portion of very important instruction, in both the Old and New Testament, is given in the same mode of figurative expression. It is said by some persons, that the language in which our Lord spoke did not furnish a word denoting what is meant by our term "signify," or "represent," and that, in consequence, he was obliged to resort to the mode of speech just mentioned, as prevalent in the Scriptures; but whether, or not, we know it to be a common way of speaking, and not an incorrect one in our own language: for instance, if one person represent another, it will be said, I *am* Charles, or Thomas, or whoever the represented person may be; or, if one object represent another, it will be said, this *is* so and so; or that *is* so and so; and if such a mode of expression be found to prevail in either writing or conversation, it would denote a great weakness of understanding, to argue from it in one case, that something figurative was real, and to deny it in every other. Roman Catholics may object here, and remark, did not our Lord say, "unless ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no part with me." Yes, and he said to the woman of Samaria, "whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, it shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life:" but would there be a well of water? no—it was spiritual, and so was the other.

There is another light, in which this doctrine is so opposed to Scripture, that I am at a loss to know by what species of casuistry it can be contravened. Christ, as God, was, and is

every where present, and every where present at the same time ¶: but as man it is not so. He had but one body, and that body ascended into heaven, and, according to the nature of things, could not be personally present in two places at the same moment; for instance, it would be untrue, upon any principle of Scripture or reason, to assert that Christ was speaking bodily to one person in Jerusalem, and to another in Samaria, and to another elsewhere at the same time; for that would be making many Christs, whereas, there is, and was but one—but the doctrine of Roman Catholics is opposed to this, and asserts, that every piece of consecrated bread, which each individual receives, is not the representative, but the actual body, soul, and divinity of Christ; which makes almost as many Christs as ever there were Roman Catholics in the world; and this must necessarily be false, until those, who maintain the doctrine, prove that Christ had, or could have, more bodies than one.

Secondly, *Transubstantiation cannot be true, because it is opposed to reason and sense, and consequently a breach of duty to believe it.*

Roman Catholics, in their defence of this doctrine, not unfrequently in reply to arguments otherwise unanswerable, say, it is true there are many things connected with it we cannot understand, but though incomprehensible to our reason, yet are not all things possible with God. If such a general mode of reply as this were to be admitted as evidence in any case, men may assert what they please, and all useful inquiry respecting truth or falsehood, must in consequence cease. It has been often remarked, and certainly with much truth, that though there are many facts connected with religion *above* our reason, there are none *contrary* to it, to which latter transubstantiation most unquestionably is. God has been mercifully

pleased to endue our bodies and minds with certain faculties, capable of discriminating and arriving at accurate knowledge upon certain subjects; and He himself never requires us to believe any thing contrary to those faculties with which we are so endued: neither is it consistent with his known character of wisdom and justice, to suppose he should. There are cases, where one sense may not be sufficient for arriving at accurate knowledge, with regard to some outward appearances; such as mere sight, as it respects a reflected object; there the senses of feeling and judgment are necessary, to prevent a wrong conclusion being formed; and there are cases where the exercise of faith may be required upon subjects which, from their peculiar nature, cannot derive any evidence from the operation of the bodily senses; but where all the senses unite, in pronouncing a thing to be, it is impossible for God to require a person, endued with those senses, to believe it not to be, because it is impossible for God to act inconsistently with himself, which this would be doing, by giving means for a certain end, and requiring an end contrary to those means. Roman Catholics tell me, that what was bread and wine before consecration, is not bread and wine after, but flesh and blood under those appearances. I say it is false, because my seeing, my feeling, my smelling, my tasting and judgment, declare otherwise, and it is my duty to disbelieve it; for God would not, neither could require me to credit, what is contradicted by the means he himself has given me of judging.

*Thirdly, Transubstantiation cannot be true, because its effect is to do away the institution it pretends to perpetuate, and to substitute something else in its place.*

Upon this division of the subject, from what has been already remarked, it is not necessary to say much. The institution of our Lord's Supper is simple in its nature, and clear

in its object ;—consisting merely of the use of bread and wine, received in commemoration of his sufferings and death, that that important event may be kept alive in the remembrance of his church and people until his coming again, hence our blessed Lord says, “Do this in remembrance of me.” And the apostle Paul, on the same subject, “As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord’s death ’till he come.”

The sacrament of Roman Catholics is not commemorative, according to the simple intention of the ordinance; and they may call it what they please, it is not the supper of the Lord.

Bread and wine were the elements of his supper—theirs are not bread and wine—but flesh and blood.

In his supper bread and wine were both necessary; they do not give wine, but bread only. And in every point, in which their institution may be examined, it will be found not to be the supper of our Lord, but a sinful invention, under that name, substituted in its place, and with which the Christian religion has nothing to do.

It was mentioned in the outset, that this subject, and the one of the Virgin Mary, were selected for discussion here, because they seemed, in a great degree, to form the groundwork of that dreadful system of idolatry, with which the Roman Catholic religion is every where pregnant. With respect to the latter, so much has been said to prove the idolatrous use which is made of it, that we shall only add a single remark more. At Maynooth College, over one of the altars in the chapel, there is a small picture, intended to represent the Virgin Mary, and students are expected to make obeisance to it as they pass: this obeisance, by the *rule* of the place, don’t extend any further than a moderate inclination of the head;



but such as kneel to it, and kneel with the greatest reverence, are looked upon in the academy as giving evidence of superior piety and advancement in religion.

Transubstantiation is so particularly idolatrous, that it needs very little to be said upon it. If the bread, after consecration, be not what it was before, but the body, soul, and divinity of Christ, it is of course worshipped, and worshipped without disguise. The elevation of the host forms an important part of the ordinary mass service; and upon all those occasions, the people are required to pay it divine homage; and in Roman Catholic countries, upon certain festival days, particularly the one called Corpus Christi, it is carried through the public ways, and all who pass are obliged to humble themselves before it||.

Having arrived thus at the third subject proposed, namely,  
*“A condensed view of the nature of the Roman Catholic religion.”*

We shall arrange our consideration of it under the following heads:—

First, *That the Roman Catholic religion is the grand system which Satan, the father of lies, has set up in the world to oppose the gospel of Christ;*

Secondly, *That it is a religion dishonorable to God, and debasing to man;*

Thirdly, *That it is a spiritual tyranny, justifiable upon no principles of reason or religion, and worse than any political tyranny that ever existed upon earth.*

I am sure none of my readers will accuse me of flattery here, or is it necessary for me to say, it is not my intention they should; but if any of them may be disposed to think I speak harshly, I answer no—I do not. I write not to injure, but to

serve: it is a faithful picture, and however disagreeable it may be to many, I do not hesitate to say, that fact justifies the portrait, and duty and honesty require it should be drawn; and as the light of contrast is often the most satisfactory way in which an object can be viewed, with the reader's permission, I will endeavour to avail myself of this advantage, and beg his attention to a slight sketch of what, I humbly conceive, may be understood by "The gospel of Christ."

The two great essentials of true religion are, the fall of man, and his recovery by Jesus Christ. In the importance of those two every man without exception, is concerned; and to those every other subject, connected with religion, must have its final tendency. Adam being the head and representative of all mankind, when he fell and suffered death in consequence, all died in him. God saw the state to which man was thus reduced, and mercifully made a provision for his recovery in Jesus Christ, who by his incarnation became the second Adam, through whom life was to be obtained; hence it is said in the Bible, "As in Adam all die, even so, in Christ, shall all be made alive." 1st Cor. xv. 22. And again, "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickening spirit." 1st Cor. xv. 45. — The curse entailed by Adam was removed by Christ; hence "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Gal. iii. 13. Man, by the fall, is unable to fulfil God's law; Christ, as his substitute, has fulfilled it for him. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth." Romans, x. 4. Man, by his iniquities, is a debtor to God; and, as such, subject to the demands of his justice, and consequent punishment for failure: but Christ, as his substitute, "was wounded for our transgressions, was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." Isai. liii. 5.

Here then is fall and recovery; fall by Adam's transgression, recovery by Christ's substitution. The benefits of that substitution are received only through faith, by those who accept of it: "For by grace are ye saved, *through faith*; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast." Ephes. ii. 8 & 9. In the business of man's salvation, there is nothing left for him to do; it is all complete—the debt is all paid—the curse is all removed—the utmost requirements of God's law and justice are all satisfied. Christ is a perfect substitute; nothing can be added to perfection; and all man has to do is to believe this, and be thankful. It is a belief of this, and this only, that will lead to genuine holiness of heart and life; 'tis the persuasion of Christ, a lovely and innocent victim, suffering in our stead †, that will, when received by faith into the soul, produce such love and gratitude to him in return, as to beget a longing desire to know and to do his will; hence the Psalmist says, "I will *run* the way of thy commandments, when thou shalt enlarge my heart." Psalm cxix and 32d. And our blessed Lord, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." John xiv. 15. It is this principle that makes the real Christian feel delight in the things of religion, when, to the man of pleasure, or the world, they are a burthen, which, perhaps through necessity, he may occasionally submit to, but longs to get rid of. The obedience of love is the only obedience God will acknowledge, any other he condemns. Thus, in his description of the general judgment, Mat. xxv. he takes the works of those who are accepted as done to himself: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of *these* my brethren, ye have done it *unto me*." When those who were rejected—were rejected because, from a want of love, they never rendered any acceptable obedience; and it is said, "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of *these*, ye did it not *to me*." They never loved Christ, and

---

† See Note E.

wanting that testimony, whatever else they might have had, they could not be accepted. Again it is said, "God will render to every man according to his deeds." Rom. ii. 6. And again, "The dead were judged according to their works." Rev. xx. 12.

*Love and gratitude are the strongest affections by which the human mind can be wrought into action.*

Thus God, by his plan of salvation, has wisely engaged them on his side; and, as the happiness of the creature consists in obedience to the Creator, he has also manifested his mercy in the arrangement, by associating duty and enjoyment inseparably together.

*Love and gratitude are principles which make every performance pleasant.*

Hence, "Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace." Prov. iii. 17.—"My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Mat. xi. 30,

*Love and gratitude are principles that do most, with the least consciousness of doing any thing.*

Hence, those who were accepted at the judgment, already referred to, answered, "Lord, when saw we thee in such and such a state, and did as thou sayest?" Their love was so strong, they were not aware of any return. When, on the contrary, those who were rejected said, "When saw we thee so and so, and did *not* do so and so?" Their love and gratitude were so weak, they thought they had made ample returns ||. Here we have Christ as the only substitute of the guilty, the only means of recovery from the fall. His substitution is always available, and available for all demands: are we sinners in youth? let us ask for forgiveness, nothing doubting,

---

|| See Note F.

for the sake of Christ our Saviour and our substitute. Are we sinners in manhood? let us again ask for forgiveness for the sake of Christ, our Saviour and our substitute. And are we sinners in old age, yea even to the confines of the grave; do we sin every hour and every moment in the day, in thought, word, and deed? let us ask in faith for mercy and forgiveness, through Christ our Saviour and our substitute, and such a petition was never yet sent away unanswered, nor will, to the end of time, because God delights in pardoning the guilty for the sake of Christ, "In whom he is well pleased." Such a subject as this would be a grateful one to stop and contemplate for a little—but I only fear having already gone too far, and hasten to look in the contrast, at the first division of our topic.

*That the Roman Catholic Religion is the grand system which Satan, the father of lies, has set up in the world to oppose the gospel of Christ.*

In the view we have given of the gospel of Christ, as mainly consisting of fall and recovery, the latter will be perceived to rest on a right sense of the former for support; for in proportion as men feel their own sinfulness, and the great evil of transgression, as an offence against a good and merciful God, they will be thankful for the means of recovery provided in Christ—but the Roman Catholic religion endeavours to counteract this fundamental principle, by dividing sins into mortal and venial; thus lessening the guilt of sin, in contradiction to the scriptures, which declare that "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." James ii. 10. And when we consider how extremely disposed man is to make light of his evil deeds, and to justify them, rather than the contrary, some idea may be formed how few if any offences, he would be willing to class under the head of mortal; and how readily his mind would catch at this device of Satan, to bring it from under the un-

compromising terms of gospel purity. The Devil knows, that if a scriptural view of the "exceeding sinfulness of sin" be allowed to have a place in the heart, he never could oppose the merits and substitution of Christ; but this removed, he prepares the way for his further designs, lessens the value of Christ's substitution, and draws the mind as much as possible from it, by putting a number of other meritorious substitutes in its place: as the Virgin Mary, and a variety of saints, whom Roman Catholics are taught to worship, and ask pardon for the sake of. In the service of the Mass, the following prayer is always used: "We beseech thee, O Lord, by the *merits* of thy saints, whose relics are here, and of all the saints, that thou vouchsafe to forgive me all my sins. Amen." This done, and he proceeds by aiming next at the intercession of Christ, and lessening its importance in the mind, by introducing a multiplicity of intercessors, to which the attention in Roman Catholic worship is uniformly directed. The following is the form used at confession, by members of the Church of Rome, and that kneeling before the priest.

"I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed virgin *Mary*, to the blessed St. *Michael*, Archangel, to the blessed St. *John* Baptist, to the holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, to all the Saints, and to you my ghostly Father, that I have grievously offended in thought, word and deed, &c. &c. Therefore I beseech the blessed virgin *Mary*, the blessed St. *Michael* the Archangel, the blessed St. *John* Baptist, the holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the holy saints in heaven, and you my ghostly Father, to pray to our Lord God for me."

During this process Satan artfully preserves in his system, as much of the Christian religion as will answer the purpose of a name; and by gilding his destructive invention over in this way, it serves as a lure for some on the

one hand, and a shield from others on the other. When we add to this virtual destruction of sin and substitution, all the list of services and doctrines subsequently introduced, what a formidable opponent of the gospel of Christ is the Roman Catholic religion! Tradition opposes the Bible, and says it has an equal right to be heard and believed. The Church is exalted into a kind of resting place, to which man may look with confidence for security, and in which every thing necessary for his spiritual welfare is invested; the right of private judgment is denied him, and threats and punishments brought into exercise, lest this false saviour, set up to oppose the true one, should be endangered in his existence by the permission of such a liberty. Then confessions, absolutions, pilgrimages, fastings, indulgences, host-worship, image-worship, purgatory, holy water, extreme unction, and a variety of other performances, all essential for the profession of a Roman Catholic, the decided tendency of which only can be, to oppose and finally overthrow, the gospel of Christ; and this latter effect has been produced in thousands of instances, in cases of those who rejected, and do reject revealed religion, from an impossibility of receiving all those things as the requirements of God's law. Satan having thus far succeeded, still strengthens his plan, by bringing to bear upon it the love of show and splendor, natural to man's earthly mind, and indulging it by a continued exhibition of pomp, of pageantry, and of wealth, always studied in the unmeaning mummery of a popish chapel: hence, when the destruction of the mystical Babylon is foretold in the Bible, the merchants of the earth are represented as "weeping and mourning, for having lost the sale of their gold, their silver, and their precious stones, their fine linen, their purple, and their silk, &c." Rev. xviii. 11, & 12. And in every instance, in which the Roman Ca-

tholic religion is viewed, whether it relate to *peculiar doctrine* or practice, it will be found to stand opposed to the gospel of Christ.

Secondly, *That the Roman Catholic Religion is dishonorable to God, and debasing to man.*

That a system, unquestionably set up to oppose the religion of Christ, must be dishonorable to God, requires very little argument to prove; and as little, that it must be debasing to man, for whose advantage that religion was intended. To use images, when God has forbidden them, must dishonor him much. To confess sins to a priest, when God has given the privilege of confessing immediately to himself, must slight and dishonour him much. To look for the intercession of saints, when God, at an infinite price, has provided an all-sufficient intercessor in Christ must slight and dishonor him much. It would insult a king to do so, who himself is but a man; it would insult a prince, if he waited to receive our petitions and grant our requests, and expected us to come in person, if in place of it we employed a messenger, or sent a servant for the purpose; and upon what principle can it be different with God? The very fact argues a contempt for his character, and is nothing more or less than a denial of his condescension, and a mockery of his mercy. Some may say these images, confessions, and intercessions, still regard God: impossible, the soul that loves him will never use an image; no one to confess to, no intercessor, but him; none, none, whatever; all others are an insult and dishonor||. Any thing that lowers man beneath the level God intended him to occupy, necessarily degrades and debases him. No man can go to a priest to confess his sins, without suffering considerable debasement of mind, because he acts below his privilege; a privilege which dignifies him, by allowing him to



go himself into the immediate presence of the Most High. And what can he tell a priest? The consequences of such a practice are destructive beyond calculation, and would require a treatise in themselves to do them any thing like justice. That practice, I hesitate not to assert, has produced more immorality and open profaneness than any one system, under the name of religion, that ever existed upon earth.

When you think of the numbers of Roman Catholics, who believe that confession obtains them pardon for the past, and liberty for the future;

When you think what an influence this feeling must produce, by destroying all proper sense of accountability to God in the mind;

When you think of the great importance of secret, humble confession of sin to the Divine Being, together with man's natural dislike to engage in it, and the eagerness with which his mind will catch at any wretched substitute, that will relieve him from the performance of so unpleasant a duty;

When you think of the description of men Roman Catholic Priests, for the most part are known to be;

When you think of the number of persons there are, who from education, and a variety of other circumstances, can neither esteem or respect them;

When you think of the temptation such a practice holds out to concealment and deceit;

When you consider men's views, with respect to the evil and extent of sin;

When you think of to what a still more miserable compass that must be narrowed, from the very circumstance of being obliged to tell their faults to a human creature, with

whom, perhaps, they will be obliged the next day to eat and to sup, and to sit with, and whose judgment, it is not improbable, may be as weak as their discretion is untrusty;

When you think of the absolution and penance that follow, and all the concomitant and false ideas, that upon such a procedure associate themselves in the mind, with reference to the atonement of Christ, human merit, and the only basis upon which pardon for sin can be obtained: I say, when you think of all these things, and this is but a faint and hasty outline, you may form some little distant estimate of the immense evils which result from this obtrusive and unjustifiable practice.

The whole of the Roman Catholic system is debasing to man: it forbids the exercise of his judgment, by requiring him to believe what others say is right, without allowing him to call in question the facts necessary to substantiate their evidence. It imposes penances, it inflicts persecutions, it holds out threats, it thunders anathemas, it employs excommunications, and all for what? If a rational and accountable creature dare to think for himself.

It corrupts the man, it darkens his countenance, it degrades his mind, it enslaves his will, it brings every thought, every disposition, and every energy into abject subjection to itself. And that all these effects are produced, no man of light, of knowledge, or of liberty, who casts his eye over a Roman Catholic district, who looks into a popish seminary, a nunnery, or a cloister, will venture for a moment to deny.

Thirdly, *The Roman Catholic system is a spiritual tyranny, justifiable upon no principles of reason or religion, and worse than any political tyranny that ever existed upon earth.*

When I get upon this division of our subject, Popery

presents such a hideous aspect that it is as unpleasant, as it is difficult, to speak of it as it deserves. To trace its history, to look at its arrogance, its presumption, its despotism, its excessive cruelty, and all the malignant features that mark its character, is no easy task; and to take those things, and to place them in connexion with its infallibility, and the various circumstances which unfold its *real* character in the present day, is a duty, the performance of which is often necessary, and though I fear too frequently overlooked, I shall not take that view of it now, but rather confine what we wish to say, with regard to it, to a few plain facts, which come under the observation of ordinary observers in every day's occurrence.

Political tyranny always refuses any thing of chartered rights to the people, because such a measure is not compatible with its system. So it is with popery. The Bible contains the chartered rights of every individual under heaven. It contains the sign manual of their King, their Sovereign, and their Judge. It is the book of their liberty, their privileges, and their lives. It is the gift of the Eternal Father, the purchase of the Eternal Son, the work of the Eternal Spirit: but Roman Catholics have, for years, denied it to the people; and because they knew their system would not bear its light, have tyrannically kept back this inestimable blessing of wisdom and of love,

Political tyranny is destructive of individual good, and social well-being. So is popery. It exercises the right of sending its messengers into the houses of its poor professors, and removing the scriptures of truth from their shelves, and substituting any thing, or every thing it pleases in their room. It exercises the right of dealing out what instruction it thinks proper under pains and penalties, if what others have to say be countenanced or attended to. It exercises the right of remonstrance without reason, and command without autho-

rity; of keeping the children of the poor, and the children of the rich where it can, from schools adapted for their bodily as well as mental good, and tending to the improvement and general advancement of society.

Political tyranny always carries on its measures by terror||. So it is with popery. With it tenderness never wins, argument never convinces, or truth never overcomes. The man who loses his Bible dislikes the principle that removed it; but terror keeps him in abeyance. If schools happen to be provided for the children, in place of those they have been unjustly prevented from assembling in, they almost universally dislike, and speak against them; but terror drags from them a reluctant attendance, and makes the almost as unwilling parent assist in enforcing its regularity. We said that the Roman Catholic system is a tyranny, worse than political tyranny: political tyranny may derive at times, from peculiar circumstances, some reasonable color of justification; religious can derive none. The one injures only present good, popery does that too, and also extends its baneful influence to interests the other cannot reach.

Thus far, and the argument arrives at a point, that not inappropriately, prepares us for the succeeding subject, which is—

*Some remarks relative to the discipline pursued in Maynooth College.*

The Roman Catholic religion is so utterly destitute of all foundation in scripture, history, or reason, that it is to that source, and to that source only, the measures thus described are to be traced. That is the reason why Bibles are obnoxious; that is the reason why schools are dreaded; that is the

---

|| See Note I.

reason why terror, operating on ignorant and prejudiced minds is resorted to, to enforce and carry on measures which otherwise could not be attempted: not that when I assert this, I mean to say, that all Roman Catholic Clergy are using their influence to uphold a system which they know to be injurious, or are convinced in their judgments is false; for though the evils complained of are to be traced to the cause mentioned, it does not follow that the persons instrumental in perpetuating them, are always aware of the fact, neither do I believe they are. Many people, whose minds have been much impressed with the absurdities of popery, have said, 'Is it possible Roman Catholic Priests can believe what they teach the people!' For my own part, that all do I would not pretend to say; for there are, no doubt, many amongst them capable of thinking one thing, and from various motives saying another, as well as other men: but that many do, I think it is not reasonable to question, as it is very possible to conceive of men, and such are often met with, who mistake falsehood for truth, and truth for falsehood, from the prejudices of early education, from long habit of viewing a subject in one particular light, and from rarely being allowed to intimate doubts themselves on the subject, or seldom to hear them from others. The system of education pursued by Roman Catholics in all cases where they can, but particularly with those intended for orders, is not to expand the mind—but to contract it; not to cultivate a spirit of enquiry—but by every practicable means to repress it; not to let light in—but as much as possible to keep it out; so that when a young man has completed in an academy, the time thought necessary to fit him for ordination, he is like one, who from being confined for a length of time in a dark room, has had his sight so impaired that it is incapable of discerning any object clearly, and feels even the action of light unpleasant, and often insupportable. Besides, the greater part of those who wish to become priests are generally men of gloomy, unsocial habits, fond of

asceticity and mysticism; and the course prepared for them to pass through fosters this tendency, and meets a correspondent feeling in their own minds ||. The mode of discipline pursued in Maynooth, is framed with a view of engendering those habits, and of closing, as much as possible, every avenue by which light might be conveyed to the mind. The young men are kept very strict in their attendance, upon what is called their religious duties; such as masses, observance of festivals, confessions, and various other ceremonies, which tend to occupy the mind without in any way improving it.

Silence is not only recommended as a habit, which the attention should be much directed to the cultivation of, but by the rule of the place it is, upon several occasions enforced.

The junior classes are not allowed to speak to the senior; the more advanced students have rooms to themselves; in other cases never more than two are together, and it is expected they should use reserve—but particularly be silent after they retire to rest; and during the time of meals one of the young men is employed reading some part of the Old Testament, which he does sufficiently loud to prevent conversation, but seldom in a way that what he says can be understood.

If a young man, upon any occasion, go outside the gate without special leave, he is expelled. One day in the week the inmates are allowed, for a short time, to take a walk in the country for recreation, but it must be in a body, with their academic dress, and accompanied by some of the superiors: and on another in the week they are allowed, in the same way, to go into the town, for the purpose of buying any thing they

---

|| See Note K.

may want; but, in either case, if one be known to separate from the body, he is expelled. By the former plan, with respect to silence, a monkish habit is engendered; and by the latter it may be perceived, the students act as spies upon one another.

No young man is allowed to have any book which the superiors of the college do not approve of, no matter upon what subject; but there is a particular severity with respect to works of religious controversy: and if a student be suspected of having such a book, the college scrutinizes the thing most narrowly, often searches the rooms for the purpose of discovery, for which it is provided with skeleton keys, and can and does occasionally resort to opening desks and trunks, when it apprehends danger or close concealment.

The vigilant observance of this rule is of such importance, that it is carried to a great extent, even to the possession of a news-paper for private use, which in *no* case is permitted; for the exhibition of one of *any* kind by a lad in the hall, he is expelled||.

If one of the students be known to go to church, or any place of worship but a Roman Catholic chapel, it is an offence of so atrocious a character, that it would not admit of a moment's compromise. As there are many cases, in which the superiors of the college cannot resort to expulsion, being prohibited by the statutes, except in certain specified misdemeanors, they often, when they think a lad has been too

---

|| This tyrannical institution, is no small proof of what has been just remarked on that subject. The most Roman Catholic Paper published, forms no exception to the excluding rule; lest some advertisement, or passing paragraph, might excite enquiry, or convey instruction to the minds of any of the enslaved inmates of that dark abode.

liberal in his views, refuse him orders upon some pretence or other, and get rid of him by that means.

Only think, Reader, what a mind a person must have who is thus watchfully disciplined for several years !

Every generous feeling and valuable quality repressed and blighted, by an unnatural and unjustifiable interdict upon the blessings of social and friendly conversation.

A brother, who is a junior, on no occasion allowed to speak to a brother who is a senior. This has often been the case, and severely felt.

That though a father, or near relative, came to see a student, he would not be allowed, even at the hours of pastime and recreation, to gratify the feeling of his heart by accompanying them a short way on their return.

All mental gloom, every inlet by which a single ray of light might approach closed and sealed. Spies, monitors, searches, enquiries, skeleton keys, pick-locks, and all such means kept in vigilant and continual operation. Truth never requires any of these measures. Truth will not dread a book, a news-paper, or conversation ; truth will give free egress and regress ; concealment, in every case, denotes something bad, something that dreads detection. Conscious rectitude always courts the light, and solicits investigation. Roman Catholics will of course attempt to justify all this, nay even contend for it as laudable. They will say, who can blame those who are entrusted with the care of others, for exercising wholesome measures of discipline and restraint ? Who can blame those, who are entrusted with the instruction of others, for preventing them reading such books as are unfit for their perusal ? Who can



blame the father of a family, for preserving a continued attention to the conduct and the principles of his children? Would not he be censurable if he did not? and would not the others be censurable also, if they were remiss in their duty? This is a specious mode of reasoning that has silenced many an objector—but the gentlemen advancing it should know, that the best principle may, and often is abused to cover the worst conduct. It is very good to exercise discipline, but very bad to use the principle as a sanction for encroachment upon personal liberty. It is very good to discountenance the reading of injurious books, but very bad to enforce by its propriety, measures intended to keep out all valuable light and knowledge from the mind.

The father of a family does very well, to maintain a diligent watchfulness over the conduct and principles of his children; but does very ill, if he make the principle an excuse for tyranny; or the prohibition of such books as duty and propriety require he should give them. If he be a licentious man, he may interdict all moral publications; if he be a deist, all such as are favorable to revelation; if a Roman Catholic, such as are opposed to his sentiments in that way, and thus proceed upon the defence of an originally useful principle, to the utter destruction of all that is valuable in this life, or important in the life to come.

There is a certain boundary, by which our conduct with regard to each other must be confined, and if that be exceeded, authority ceases to exist on one side, and disobedience becomes a duty on the other. Thus, if a parent say to his child, 'you must not pray, or you must not read the Bible,' the parent in such a case, has outstepped the bounds of his authority, and the child's duty consists in disobedience.

There are also cases in the ordinary progress of education,

between master and scholar, student and preceptor, where authority has no right to be exercised, and attempts to enforce it is a breach of propriety. To those two cases I consider the conduct of Maynooth-Professors is applicable, and that it is the duty of young men there to leave the place, if they do not obtain a practical recognition of their undoubted rights: and if these remarks should fall into the hands of any such, I tell them freely that they are submitting, in their present course, to a degradation of their persons; and an unjustifiable encroachment upon liberties God intended for them, and privileges no man has a right to withhold. However a system of education may be restricted with regard to children, as they advance to manhood, if their real interests be consulted, they should be left pretty much unrestrained as to the choice of their ordinary reading: and when a college is formed for the purpose of fitting lads for what are termed the learned professions, the Principals of the institution do their duty, when they pay a due attention to moral and religious instruction; a reasonable regard to discipline, with reference to order, and require students to go through such a course of reading as is thought best adapted for the improvement of their understanding, and a suitable qualification for the profession each may make choice of: but they depart widely from their duty, if they prohibit young men from having and reading such works of history, religion, or general literature, as they may feel disposed for; if they prohibit news-papers, or any other periodical publication; or descend to the business of prying inquisitors, and encroachers upon the free exercise of friendly and of social intercourse.

Having thus completed the four subjects proposed for consideration, I was about to engage the reader's attention for a little with a few remarks upon the only remaining topic: the one intended to form the conclusion of this address: but I feel happy in having it to state, that I had done

scarcely more than shape in thought the line of argument it appeared necessary to adopt, when my attention was called away by an advertisement of "A Refutation of an insidious pamphlet, entitled, A Correspondence between a Roman Catholic Priest and a Protestant Layman." This circumstance, you must perceive, will necessarily change our plan a little; but, as it has occurred, I feel glad that it did so at a period, when we were just entering upon the subject of which it in propriety takes the place; and in consequence, what has been written may remain unaltered. I might fulfil a part of the pledge yet, for in truth the "Refutation" is so completely foreign to what it professes to be, that it appears surprising how the gentleman who wrote it could have ventured to give it publicity, as a reply to the Correspondence—but I shall accept of it as he intended, and answer it in that light. Instead of the title of "a Catholic Layman," under which he writes, I shall, with his leave and yours reader, substitute that of Respondens, and advert to him under this name, as "Catholic Layman" is rather long to write frequently; and if the gentleman will not be offended with me for the liberty I take in saying so, I do it also, partly from an impression of the signature not corresponding with the fact. As we have hitherto pursued the mode of dividing our subjects, I shall do the same with respect to the pamphlet, and examine it under the following heads:

- First, *Personal*;
- Secondly, *General Remarks*;
- Thirdly, *Quotations*;
- Fourthly, *Failure in Reply*.

With respect to the first, I shall not occupy my time in transcribing, or yours in reading, the low, vulgar abuse, with which Respondens has been pleased to fill so many of his pages, it reflects much more discredit upon himself than it can possibly do upon me. I could not expect better. Abuse has always proved a convenient cover for want of argument. Respondens had a bad cause, and I feel too much

compassion for him, and respect for the truth I humbly endeavour to defend, to violate its sacred precepts by returning "railing for railing." The force of truth invariably produces either conviction or anger, and all the punishment I will inflict upon Respondens for his unhandsome language, is, to request, that at some cool moment of reflection, he will read it over and be sorry for his offence. Respondens accuses L. of "bad temper." If L. were to say he is free from the infirmities of human nature, it would be saying what he does not think; but when R. supposes any strong language used in the Correspondence proceeded from that cause, he assures him it is a mistake. When a person from a sense of duty, strongly reprobates the principles of another, it is difficult, perhaps impossible, entirely to separate their *justly* associated anger from the person defending those principles. There is a certain indignation, the expression of which is not only allowable, but its absence culpable; and when L. used strong language, if it will not be presuming too much for him to say so, R. will find the spirit under which he wrote manifested in two instances amongst many; in the 10th verse of the 13th chapter of the Acts, and the 7th of the 3d of Matthew. In addition to this he confesses, that when he conceived the determination of publishing the Correspondence and connecting a challenge with it, he wrote in a strain different from what he otherwise would have done, or is in the habit of doing, in order if possible to provoke Roman Catholics into a discussion, which it appeared to him, and appeared with regret, that scripture, moderation, sound sense, and sound argument, had all failed of producing; and in this latter respect, the publication now before him is a slight proof he was not mistaken—but if L. were betrayed into any thing of unwarrantable or unchristian language, he is more disposed to regret the circumstance than defend it, and rather obliged for R.'s observation than angry at the manner in which it has been made.

*General Remarks.*

Respondens's figure, in page 1, of "a chain slowly and gradually winding itself, link after link, round the long divided people of Ireland," does not convey a pleasant idea to the mind. The emblem of a chain is very different from what R. intended to represent by it—but it is a question whether, in some respects he was not involuntarily led into an expression of the truth.

Page 6. Speaking of the extent, union, and faithfulness of the Roman Catholic community, he says, "which happy end is attained through the means of that infallibility with which the Redeemer blessed his church."

What does R. mean by the Church? Is it the entire body of professing Roman Catholics, or a certain number of faithful within that body? To which do those who maintain free will, and those who deny it belong? To which those who say there is no salvation out of their church, and those who are not so hardened as to think so? To which those who contend respecting the Virgin Mary? To which the Montani, and the Ultra Montani? Are these conflicting disputants each infallible, or are they integral parts of one infallible whole? Satan drew the bow too tight when he introduced that doctrine into his scheme; it is a bar to all amendment, and must eventually destroy the system it was intended to protect.

Page 10. "Is it possible that the Scriptures dictate Atheism, which you cannot deny having sprung from the Bible?"

Atheism sprung from the Bible!! I think I do not do Respondens any injustice when I say, that he has taken

up with something very remote from the Bible, or he could not write so deeply blasphemous a sentence as that.

Page 11. "To *private judgment* we owe the blasphemies of Paine, Voltaire and Gibbon; to private judgment we can trace the diabolical tenets of Diderot and Volney, &c. &c."

Such writers as Respondens seem to forget, that it is to the corruption of man's heart every evil is to be traced, and it is to that cause, (Mark vii. 22.) is ascribed the evil he has just proved himself guilty of, in common with those names he mentions, and with whom I fear he is too well acquainted. If the right of private judgment, against which he contends, have produced infidelity and deism, what is it has produced those evils amongst Roman Catholics? With whom it is not necessary for me to tell him; the latter, even in the very seminaries for educating their priesthood, is often the fashion and order of the day: it is well known that many of the better educated portion of Roman Catholics are either concealed or avowed deists. How will Respondens account for this?

Page 12. "We recommend and applaud the general promulgation of Holy Writ; we strenuously advocate the study of the Bible."

How far the conduct of Roman Catholics would bear an investigation into this sentiment, Respondens must be the best judge, particularly in countries entirely under their influence, where a person might travel miles and never meet with a Bible, not even in a chapel or a convent. But as I would wish to write not to combat, but to do good, I hope any Roman Catholic who reads this permission, if he have not a Bible, will immediately endeavour to get one, and he may be assured he will learn more from it in one month,

than all the priests and prelates of his church would or could teach him in one thousand.

Page 14. "Nor am I one of those who delight in garnishing every page with a pious string of scriptural phrases and quotations, the specious trap for the unwary, and the common trick of the unlearned."

How easy it is to discover under this, and many other such passages in Respondens's pages, a mind at enmity with the book he professes to approve. This sentence is much to the honor of the sacred scriptures—for R. knows well that the system he endeavours to defend, will find too little to sanction it in these blessed records, to allow him to resort to them for defence. His book presents but two instances, one is a misrepresentation, and the other is misapplied: "No prophecy of the scripture is of private interpretation." 2 Pet. i. 20. Respondens applies this passage to *reading* the scriptures, when Peter was not speaking of reading but *writing* them, two very different things; that holy men of old did not write them as matters of their own opinion, but as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The other, "And lo! a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a Son." No Protestant denies that Mary was a virgin before the birth of our Lord.

The sentence at the head of this paragraph endeavours to bring those into contempt who refer to the Bible; and in page 11 Respondens says, "Roman Catholics consider the Bible the most perfect and the most admirable book in the world." Another instance of contradiction appears in page 12 and 3, where in the former, already referred to; he says, "we recommend and applaud the general promulgation of Holy Writ:" and in the latter he speaks of the writer of the Correspondence as a pompous declaimer, using the common arguments of *the supporters* of Bible Societies." Though these inconsistencies evidently show Respondens not to be what he

wishes to be thought, I bring them forward chiefly for the purpose of cautioning those who might otherwise be led astray from the appearance he assumes.

The first paragraph of the 15th page is also a misrepresentation; for a reference to the Correspondence will show, that Mary's not being under any obligation, is spoken of with respect to Christ in the character of *Redeemer*, and that only.

Page 22. "It remains a curious fact, that the Apostles established the communion of the *Catholic* faith, from which Protestants are said to differ so widely."

I suppose Respondens intends his readers to understand by "*Catholic*," the Roman Catholic faith—but I can tell them they did no such thing, but reprobated and condemned it as a diabolical heresy in perspective.

Page 23. "What an instance of the sublime! In searching for a great image, to which to liken his God, he compares him to a mighty *man*!"

It partakes of more of the sublime than any thing L. pretends to; and Respondens's ignorance of the scriptures prevented him knowing, that when he quarrelled with it, he was quarrelling with God's own description of himself. Psalm 78th and 65.

Page 24. "We believe as much as you believe, but as an enlightened member of your church remarked, we are condemned because we believe something more."

If R. had stated what that *something more* is, his readers might have derived some advantage from his publication, but this he could not venture to do, as a little examination



would show, that to believe what Protestants believe, and to believe *the something more* in addition, is an impossibility. As far as consistency is valuable, the avowed deist is a much more consistent man than the professing Roman Catholic. The one rejects all; the other says he believes things, that from their own nature must be at variance with one another.

Page 25. "When L. sat down to attack and expose what he terms the impiety of the Catholic religion, he should have known that it was necessary to understand something about that religion. He should have known something about the belief as to the virgin Mary, when he stated that she was considered pure and spotless, born in purity and without sin: he should have enquired, and been positive as to facts, before he presumed to arraign by his imaginary statements, and convict us on his conclusions."

The quotations already made from Respondens's prayer-book with respect to the Virgin Mary, go pretty nearly to show, that L. was not mistaken as to Roman Catholic belief on the subject. The following, however, from the same source, leaves nothing to doubt:

"The maid whom for Mother He had elected,  
That she might be never with sin infected,  
Hail flourishing Virgin. Thou pure above angels."

"Hail, blessed Virgin Mary! Mother of God! Queen of heaven! gate of paradise! and lady of the world! Thou art a singular pure virgin! thou wert conceived without sin, conceivedst also, and brought forth without blemish, your son Jesus, the Creator and Redeemer of the world. All this I do believe undoubtedly. Pray for me, &c."

These quotations, in connexion with Respondens's charge, need no comment.

Page 25. "If Protestant disputants feel uneasy at the problematical opinions of the schools, they should remember that those are not the *articles of faith*; and whether acknowledged or rejected, cannot effect the great principles of belief."

It might have been of use, if R. had left out some of the abusive pages of his book, and told what those *problematical opinions* are, which he seems so willing to give up; also what the *articles of faith* are, which are taught by the infallible church he in another place alluded to, as these it is to be supposed are what he speaks of as "the great principles of belief." He says also that L. will not understand what he means by this—but L. can assure him he understands it very well; and to prove he does, takes the liberty of informing him that this "*word for the wise*," this "*double dealing*," will not do; and that honesty has always proved "the best policy."

Page 26. "The Catholic Church recognizes certain doctrines, which are denied by the Protestant. The Catholic Church gives to its professors minute rules for moral conduct; the Protestant only affords, what they call, the general rule of faith. The Catholic Church is particular—the Protestant general in its admonitions."

This looks well on paper, but certainly no where else: it is very like the language of a man who is clinging to a system he does not believe, but for ulterior purposes struggles to maintain; who wishes to keep the many in ignorance, that the few may be benefitted by the fraud. "The Catholic Church recognizes certain doctrines denied by the Protestant." Yes, and that should be denied strenuously, and exclaimed against publicly, by every man who loves his Bible and his God. "The Catholic Church gives to its professors minute rules for moral conduct." Minute rules for

moral conduct! could R. say what they are? Is the second commandment one of them—and the greater part of God's *moral* law mutilated and suppressed? Moral conduct! If the gentleman had said minute rules for *immoral* conduct, he would be much nearer the truth, and certainly no one could oppose him from a want of sufficient evidence to substantiate the fact.

Page 29. "Correspondens advises L. to prove his loyalty by obeying his Majesty's paternal advice, which recommends "that *every cause* of irritation should be avoided and discountenanced, and mutual forbearance and good-will observed and encouraged."

When L. published the Correspondence, he had nothing of a political nature in view, even in the appeal to the King and his ministers, to which some through mistake, supposed that part of the pamphlet was intended to have a reference—but as the subject has been introduced here, L. cannot forbear saying, that he is certain when our gracious Monarch recommended "mutual forbearance and good-will," he never intended to preclude by it, a free and open discussion upon those great points of religious faith, which form the doctrines of that incomparable church establishment, over whose interests his Majesty is the lawful and the rightful guardian: and when Roman Catholics attempt to wrest it to such a purpose, sure I am, they will find in the heart and understanding of our good King, a principle every way opposed to such a perversion of his most affectionate and gracious intentions. Humble an individual as I am, I would not yield to any man in dutiful attachment and genuine loyalty to my Sovereign. Yes, I respect kingly authority, because "Honor to the King" is placed in immediate association with "the Fear of God," the noblest principle, and the highest duty which a rational and intelligent creature can be called to exercise—but what Roman Catholics, and un-

happily many Protestants, wish to have understood by conciliation never can be effected through the means, which seem so far to have been brought to bear upon it. Man may not improperly be considered, a religious animal; God, the wise and powerful author of all things, has so immoveably impressed upon his mind, feelings of his being an immortal and accountable creature, that wherever you find him those principles manifest themselves in some way or other; and as those are the most important of his being, they have a mingled influence upon every calling and relation of life; and in consequence, it is in proportion as men approximate to each other in their religious sentiments and views, that a basis for permanent good-will is laid.

Upon this principle, which I apprehend few will be disposed to deny, the differences between Protestants and Roman Catholics are so many and so important, that a rational lasting conciliation never can be effected, except in one of two ways, either both abstaining from all religious conversation, or one or the other abandoning their profession. To attempt the establishment of civil and religious harmony by any other means, will be found as absurd as placing a ponderous roof upon a wall unable to sustain it; or erecting a stately edifice on a foundation insufficient for its support. If Roman Catholics are really sincere in their desires for conciliation, as they say they are, let them evidence it by a bold, affectionate, uncompromising endeavour to enlighten the minds of the people. Let them embrace every opportunity of bringing what they think to be religious truths before them. Let them meet Protestants in fair, public, and energetic discussion on these subjects. Let them cordially unite with those who are engaged in circulating the scriptures. Let them act in their colleges as Protestants do in theirs. Let the students have liberty to buy and read whatever books they may think proper, that are not condemned by the good and wholesome laws of our land. Let them give

their people the unrestrained exercise of private judgment, and then follow up that liberty by expostulation, reason, and argument. This would be a rational mode of procedure, an honest one, such as the divine blessing might be expected to accompany. This would be like skillful physicians, striking at the root of the disease. If Roman Catholics are right, Protestants must be wrong; and if the former think themselves right, this is the line that candor and duty point out. An honest cause has nothing to fear, and if Roman Catholics decline pursuing those means, I hesitate not to tell it, and to tell it to the country, and the world, that conciliation is not their object, but something else under the cover of its name.

### *Quotations.*

As Respondens should be very well aware that the sentiments of ten, or ten thousand human writers, don't alter the nature of what is right or wrong. I might with great propriety take no notice of this part of his pamphlet; and would in all probability pursue that mode, were it not for the opportunity an opposite course gives me, of showing some of his readers to what means Roman Catholics are capable of descending, in order, if possible, to put a gloss upon a system which is really false and indefensible. The names R. quotes are,

<i>Whitaker,</i>	<i>Montague,</i>
<i>Hooker,</i>	<i>Fulke,</i>
<i>Chillingworth,</i>	<i>Thorndyke, and</i>
<i>Bollingbroke,</i>	<i>Beard;</i>

and he brings these writers forward as defenders of the doctrines condemned in the Correspondence: but how stands the fact? *Montague* is nothing more or less than a Roman Catholic; and *Bollingbroke* a profound deist!! The quotations he gives from these two writers, are the only ones that have the slightest bearing on his subject; the former

in defence of saint and image worship, and the latter against the Bible! To the honor of the Protestant cause, when he wanted a name under which to shelter himself, in his attack upon the scriptures, he could not find one, except in the writings of a man who denied the religion of his God and Saviour!!

*Whitaker* was a most respectable Protestant writer, who strongly contended with the Roman Catholics of his day, for refusing the scriptures to the people, which they maintained should not be given to them; and in the chapter from which R. gives his misrepresented quotation, he says, for he wrote in Latin—

*“Nos contrarium tuemur, scripturas non ita esse difficiles, quin a populo legi cum fructu possint et debeant. Christus ait scrutamini scripturas; præceptum ergo Christi manifestum est scrutandas esse scripturas.”*

*Hooker's* writings are strongly against popery, and full of the importance and necessity of all persons reading the scriptures, which any person can satisfy themselves respecting, by referring to his Ecclesiastical Polity, from whence R. quotes a sentence, the principle of which no Protestant denies.

*Chillingworth* was also a great enemy to popery; and in the part R. quotes from him, he was saying, that he thought it possible for persons under peculiar circumstances, particularly such as never had an opportunity of seeing or getting a Bible, to be saved, provided they believed and performed all that the gospel covenant required: however, he acknowledged this to be a matter of speculation, which he submitted to the judgment of others. And if R. had given the passage fairly this would be seen. His book is entitled, “The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation.” And what is more remarkable, the chapter from which R.

quotes, is headed, "Scripture the *only* rule whereby to judge of controversies." And in No. 10 of that chapter he says, "God, *de facto*, hath ordered the matter so, that all the gospel of Christ, the *whole* covenant between God and man, is now written, whereas, if he had pleased he might so have disposed it, that part might have been written and part unwritten, and then he would have taken order to whom we should have had recourse for that part of it which was not written; which seeing he hath *not* done, it is evident he hath left *no part* of it unwritten."

*Fulke*, *Thorndyke*, and *Beard*, are as much against R.'s purpose, with respect to saints and images, as the others with regard to the scriptures. *Thorndyke*, which is the most known of the three, from his great dislike to the puritans, seemed in his latter writings to be led into an unjustifiable spirit of compromise with Papists, for which he has been condemned by Protestants. But in his Epilogue to the tragedy to which R. refers, he speaks in the most decided manner against addressing saints. Page 355. "He that knows the God-head of Christ to be the ground, in consideration whereof the obedience of Christ is acceptable to God for granting us helps of grace, and yet will needs say that saints or angels are our mediators, intercessors, or advocates, to the same effect there is no cause why he should be excused of IDOLATRY." Again, "But he that saith the saints and angels pray for us, saith not that we are to pray to saints or angels, nor can he say it without idolatry." Page 356. And he does not say *all* the fathers addressed saints, as R. improperly states it—but "the *lights* of the Greek and Latin Church," which were comparatively few in number; and accounts for it on the principle of the growing corruption of the times with regard to religion. His words are, "After Constantine, when the festivals of the saints being publicly celebrated, occasioned the confluence of *gentiles*, as well as Christians, I acknowledge those great lights

did think fit to address themselves to them as petitioners—but so at the first—as those that were no ways assured by our common Christianity, that their petitions arrived at their knowledge, as in some instance in a letter which a man would write, though uncertain whether it will come to hand or not.” Page 358 & 360.

Here, Reader, you have the real sentiments of those writers, whom Respondens would make you suppose were advocates for popish doctrine; and as one bad principle will be found in connexion with another, when he concludes his false statement he proceeds: “What a pit the champion has fallen into! what a path of disgrace has he traced for himself! Did the gentleman write in ignorance of those authorities, or did he wilfully write, knowing them to exist? If the first he has exposed his unfitness for the task he undertook—if the second, he has attempted to deceive the public. He may plead ignorance, or duplicity, to protect him from the odium that will fall upon him; but at all events, he cannot shelter himself from the positive fact of being either a dunce or a knave.” With such a collection of every thing that is odious, what would I not be warranted in saying? But there is nothing necessary. The deceit is too plain to be mistaken, and the abusive conclusion I have no inclination to retort.

The next, and last part of our remarks, on R’s production, is—

#### *Failure in Reply.*

I am sure this must be so self-evident to every person, who has put the Correspondence and the Refutation together, that for them very little need be said on the subject: but as it is likely not a few may have satisfied themselves with reading the latter, and deriving from it only their



knowledge of the former, for their sakes we shall give a brief outline of what the Correspondence contained.

“That the Bible is unfavorable to the Catholic religion, and Roman Catholics are unfriendly to its circulation on that account.”

“That the Roman Catholic Church is rapidly declining.”

“That every man has an undoubted right to read the Bible; and whoever attempts to prevent it, acts contrary to the will of God.”

“That the alleged antiquity of the Church of Rome is no proof of its truth.”

“That the unanimity of sentiment Roman Catholics deduce, in proof of their being right, is almost a conclusive evidence they are wrong; and that differences of religious opinion amongst Protestants, is a circumstance strongly in their favor.”

“That the fact of people making a bad use of the Bible, is no reason why it should be withheld from them.”

“That all Roman Catholic places and countries are disgracefully immoral.”

“That the traditions of the Church of Rome, to which most of her doctrines are to be traced, viewed in the light of reason and scripture, must necessarily be false, and in their consequences subversive of the religion of Christ.”

“That Butler’s Catechism is a most pernicious book.”

“That the Church of Rome cannot substantiate her claim to the title of a Christian Church.”

“That her doctrines are heretical and antichristian, and were not in existence for several hundred years after the Christian æra; and that they came gradually to be increased and adopted by the church, in proportion as she departed from the faith.”

“That the Apostles were all Protestants, and the early Christians, till corrupted by popery.”

“That Peter, so far from being Pope, was never even bishop of Rome; and that the Pope is “the Man of Sin,” and has no right to say he is Peter’s successor.”

“That the Church of Rome is, and always has been, an enemy to the Church of Christ.”

“That Roman Catholics, to conceal the iniquity of their idolatry, omit the second commandment from their Catechisms.”

“That the rise of the popish heresy was foretold in the Bible, and has God’s righteous indignation expressed against it there.”

R.’s Refutation does not give a single direct answer to any one of these subjects; and most of them it passes over entirely unnoticed: and now, good Roman Catholic Reader, will you only look these facts in the face? will you only consider, that in the metropolis of so Roman Catholic a country as Ireland, a charge, a serious charge has been publicly made on the doctrines you profess; and your own clergy, for your sakes, called on to come forward and disprove them, without their having ventured to do so; and that a few pages||, pro-

---

|| Equal to about twelve or thirteen of the Correspondence.

fessing to be written by a Catholic Layman, full of untruth, inconsistency, absurdity, and low virulent abuse, is the only thing that has made its appearance in reply? will you for a moment consider, what in any other case, a fact like this would prove? Think you, Sirs, if the Protestant faith were attacked, and a challenge given to defend it, that a thousand, zealous, active, unanswerable pens, would not instantly be in motion to defend the sacred cause? and that ten thousand heads, and ten thousand hearts would not rejoice in the opportunity afforded by the circumstance, of bringing forward truths, upon which without a fear, and without a doubt, they stake their everlasting hopes? Truths that only require to be examined to be received, and that never yet had occasion to skulk into a corner to hide their defects; or, from a consciousness of deficiency, to shun the scrutinizing light of a meridian sun. The Roman Catholic religion, to use plain, faithful language, is all a lie—a delusive, destructive lie. The sooner you abandon the system the better. The increase of light and knowledge which has taken place within the past ten or fifteen years, is making it shake to its foundation. Say not, we will leave those things to our clergy, they must have good reason for believing what they teach, otherwise they would not require us to believe it. That they have not, the circumstance before you ought to be a sufficient proof. Examine into these things yourself, it is your own interests are concerned. You would not speak thus if your health were in danger, and a fear expressed as to the skill of your physician. You would not speak thus if your property were at stake, and there were reasons for doubting the competency of your lawyer; and why would you be disposed to act less wisely in a concern, that of all others requires the greatest care? Speak not so foolishly we intreat you; life is hastening to an end, and all its concerns are vanity. Here all are shadows, to come all is substance; here all is visionary, to come all is

reality; and what will you do when you enter upon this substance and upon these realities—if you learn, and learn at a period too late to remedy the evil: that in the only important concern of life you had acted with a folly, you would have been ashamed to own in the commonest occurrence of a scene that is past and gone for ever? These, dear friends, are weighty considerations; so weighty that I shall take leave of you, by earnestly saying, as the angel did to Lot of old, “Escape for thy life, look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the plain, lest thou be consumed.”

## *SECOND PART.*

---

TO THE

**PROTESTANT CLERGY**

OF

**IRELAND;**

**GENTLEMEN,**

**AS** the great evils resulting from the unhappy prevalence of the Roman Catholic religion in this country, is a subject in which you may be expected to feel particularly interested, the writer takes the liberty of calling your attention to a few remarks with respect to it, the importance of which has been strongly impressed upon his mind: and whatever apology may be necessary for his doing so, he hopes you will consider the cause as furnishing him with one sufficient for the offence: and first he begs leave to say, that in all evils connected with the subject of religion, which the mind has to deplore, it naturally turns to you, as the persons with whom the remedy in a great measure may be considered as resting; and in this view it appears to him, that the remedy in the case complained of, as yet has been but very partially administered. That decided means, commensurate with the evils of popery, have not been hitherto

exercised. I confess it has not unfrequently surprised me to hear many, for whose persons and judgments I could not but entertain a respectful and affectionate esteem, complain of the errors of the Roman Catholic religion, bewail the melancholy consequences of its existence, and say they prayed for the conversion of its professors; and yet, as far as I had an opportunity of perceiving, never could see them make one direct public effort for carrying their wishes into effect—not only so—but if others came forward, and with open consistency and faithfulness, addressed themselves to the system they lamented the existence of, it seemed rather to incur their displeasure than procure their countenance and support. To wish for the conversion of Roman Catholics, and yet disapprove of directly addressing them as such, are two things that appear to me not easily reconcileable. Persons, however, who have acted thus, say they have done so upon the principle, that the best mode of accomplishing their object was not to assail popery openly, but rather to undermine it by slowly and silently embracing every opportunity for diffusing Christian light and knowledge: and the objections they have brought forward to a contrary line of conduct, seem to be embraced under the following heads, upon which, with your permission, I shall say a few words.

First, say they, ‘ Religious controversy has often so many evils connected with it, that it is better to avoid it as much as possible, and accomplish our object by other means.

The evil, I answer, consists not in the *use* but in the *abuse*, and if no exercise for the good of ourselves or others should be engaged in, except such as don’t admit of abuse—none will be engaged in—for none come under that description: and in pursuing a mode of this kind, it is doing the very thing of all others that Roman Catholics wish. They dread discussion, and whenever they are obliged to enter into it,

they invariably say as little as they can, alleging 'that they dislike religious controversy, because it is seldom productive of good.' What would have been the consequence now, if our old reformers had acted on this principle? And is it not to the reverse we are indebted for the present state of religious knowledge in Christendom? And there is reason to believe, that if Christians in those times and since, had acted with a little more of their decision and honesty for God, in exclaiming against error, their own souls would have prospered, and the church been much benefitted by the plan. It is a pity we should not manifest more zeal for the honor and for the truth of God, of which I humbly conceive this objection seems to imply a want. Love is a principle that will rather seek out opportunities—than refuse those that present themselves.

Secondly, say they, 'When you want to reform others, it is not always the best way to address yourself particularly to their faults—but rather to give them an opportunity of correcting their own conduct, by silently exhibiting a contrary example.' This, with respect to the ordinary intercourse of life, often holds true; and I am sure frequently makes the real Christian useful where he little suspects it—but when the thing to be reformed is principle rather than practice, and injurious errors that hourly affect the interests of Him, to whose interest of all others we should be most sensibly alive; as well as the well-being of others for whom it is our duty to feel, the objection will not hold, and argues an indifference to reform rather than a desire for its accomplishment.

Thirdly, say they, 'Error with one denomination of people is as bad as error with another; and are there not many Protestants, who are as irreligious and immoral in their conduct as many Roman Catholics?' It is in part true—but I take the liberty of saying, that the objection is too much like one not uncommonly made by avaricious persons when

asked to contribute to a benevolent object, "Charity begins at-home," and though they give little at-home, they shelter themselves under that cover, for not attending to calls of distress from abroad. Relieving distress abroad cultivates the disposition necessary for relieving it at-home; and on the same principle, an endeavour to reclaim the error of a stranger, will excite a stronger feeling of compassion for the mistakes of a friend. The objection, however, is not a valid one, and if admitted at all, must go with equal propriety to exertions in behalf of the Pagan or Mahometan, as well as the Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic religion is a heresy denounced in the Bible. A system opposed by Satan to the religion of Christ; productive of mental and bodily injury wherever it exists, and as such should be particularly and directly attacked.

Another objection is—'Preach the truth and error will fall before it.' This, I beg leave to say, is rather specious than true in many cases as well as the present. "Preaching the truth" is a comprehensive expression. It is well known that the most useful part of preaching consists in application; and that when men either through carelessness or inability, are deficient in this respect, their discourses, however sound in doctrine, produce very little practical effect. I ask the person making this remark, would you think you did your duty if you preached against drunkenness, without addressing the drunkard? against profane swearing, without addressing the swearer? or upon the necessity of regeneration, without applying your subject to the unregenerate? or upon justification by faith, without noticing the unbeliever? and if not, upon what principle do you suppose you discharge your duty when you touch upon doctrines suited to Roman Catholics, and neglect not only to address them by name—but pass them over altogether unnoticed, when they abound in the country where you are? Is your preaching duty never to extend to them? Could you not, when you preach upon the Lord's supper, allude to the abuse



of it in transubstantiation? could you not, when you preach upon the intercession of Christ, allude to the intercession of saints? when upon the all-sufficiency of Christ's blood to take away sin, could you not apply the subject to purgatory? when upon Divine forgiveness—to penance? when upon confession—to popish abuse in that way? And is there not reason to believe, if these subjects had not been kept so much from our churches as they have, and Roman Catholics had been affectionately named and addressed from the pulpit, that we would not have to lament over the thick, deplorable darkness which exists in this country at present?

Again, it is said, 'Do not all means, at present in use for diffusing Christian knowledge, address themselves to Roman Catholics—will not Bibles, schools, and religious publications, bring them light in time, and what more can be reasonably expected?' It is true these are all very good, and I earnestly hope will daily increase in their operation—but they are not enough, something more wants to be added: for instance, would not each of those means be indispensably necessary in an entirely protestant district, where the name of a Roman Catholic would not be known? what may be sufficient for the discharge of duty in one place, may not be sufficient for the discharge of it in another; and if this objection were to be allowed any weight, no direct exertions would ever have been made for the conversion of the Jews, a work that now seems to be taking its proper place in the estimation of Christian duty; and with respect to them, if direct and positive means in addition to Bibles, schools, and religious publications are considered necessary, why not so with regard to Roman Catholics? have they not peculiar doctrines, and peculiar errors to combat? and is it compatible with consistency, particularly to address the one, and not particularly to address the other? to rest satisfied with means as sufficient for Roman Catholics, which is thought, and thought rightly, are not sufficient for the Jews?

No, my dear Sirs, I hope this afflicting apathy will be shaken off, and that you will give a more serious consideration than ever yet has been given, to the melancholy state of our country, under the destructive influence of popish darkness.

The last and only objection I am aware of is, ‘Have not the means hitherto pursued so far tended to lessen the evils of popery, that a light now begins to dawn, which in faith and patience opens the prospect of a speedy and a rapid increase.’ I answer it is so—but that very argument should be the strongest one that could be used in favor of more direct and augmented exertions; if the Lord have been pleased in this way to give an intimation of what is in his mind, it is the duty of those who profess to love him, to watch that gracious intimation, and to start forward to his help: to hail the approach of the Most High, and by every possible means prepare the way for his reception—yes, as we would anxiously watch, and assist in furthering the desires of a long afflicted friend, whom we dearly and tenderly loved. It is when the Lord shines forth, or intimates his wish, that coldness or indifference becomes unpardonably criminal. The very light here spoken of requires additional means, in proportion to the increased capacity for seeing truths, which before its rising might not have been perceptible.

Having thus briefly endeavoured to answer the objections usually brought against decided, uncloaked measures, with regard to popery; and in the commencement mentioned, that for the exercise of remedies suited to its case, you gentlemen would naturally be looked to; you may with great propriety expect from me a statement of what I conceive those decided measures are, for the necessity of which I have been contending. First, with much respect, I humbly look upon it as your duty, to take the subject up, and remembering the large portion of the population of this country that is involved in the darkness of Roman Catholic errors, to make

those errors a point to which you will occasionally direct your public and private ministrations; to remember that the exercise of your sacred office is not to be confined to those merely of your own profession, but should also, as far as possible, be directed, to an abatement of the evils with which you are otherwise surrounded. To be zealous for God and his truth, and within the sphere of your own operations, to use faithful and active means for stirring up a spirit of temperate discussion, upon the subjects of religious difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics. I cannot, for my own part, conceive upon what possible principle the studied silence hitherto maintained upon these subjects has been founded. Surely we have nothing to fear; the cause is the cause of God; the truth is the truth of God; and the work is the work of God; and the more open, straight forward, uncompromising course that is pursued in His cause, His truth, and His work, the more will His heavenly blessing descend and rest upon it. Some of you, no doubt, have lived in parishes—where you have been surrounded by popish darkness and superstition—where you have seen hundreds, and tens of hundreds in your neighbourhood, sinking under the thralldom with which they enslave the mind. You have talked of, lamented, and perhaps wept over the evil—but have you raised your voice against it? have you endeavoured to interest your congregation in the subject? Why not? Would not this be a natural, consistent course? and if so, would it not be well immediately to put it in practice? could you not preach once or twice in the month against it, and thus call the attention of people more directly to the evil? I am inclined to think this could be very generally done without encroachments upon other calls of duty.

If Ministers in populous places throughout the country, were to select a number of subjects connected with the Roman Catholic religion, and lecture upon each of them one or

two Sunday mornings or evenings in the month; or if this were not convenient, any one or two week evenings that would suit them best, it would circulate information in that way that would be attended with much benefit; and if they gave it out in their churches the Sunday before, the subject they intended lecturing upon, and if practicable, publicly advertised it in the news-paper, it would by degrees excite an interest that would diffuse itself through their neighbourhood; and finally, however slow in its progress, reach the point they intended to touch. The few Roman Catholics who would be likely to attend, should not be an argument against the measure. Protestants want to be informed and stirred up; and though there were not a single Roman Catholic present, what is delivered will be carried into the interstices of the social compact, and gradually operate with the influence of "leaven that leaveneth the lump." Roman Catholics will hear of it, their curiosity will be excited, and it is not improbable that many priests would begin to lecture on the other side; this would set the people about inquiring, also tend to engender and keep alive the spirit, which of all others would be best adapted for the furtherance of your purpose. What an effect might be expected to result from advertisements appearing in our news-papers, that two or three men of known talent, would in their respective places of worship, on such an evening and such an hour, deliver a lecture to Roman Catholics upon such a doctrine of their religion. Though a single Roman Catholic were not to attend, the very fact of such a thing receiving publicity would be of use; it would accustom those for whose benefit it was designed, to hear and to see an assailment of their creed, and would be gradually softening the dense body of superstition, the measure was ultimately intended to liquify—but I would not fear a total absence of this kind; there is a desire for information natural to the mind, that would not resist such a solicitation to instruct it; and when the mode would extend to our villages and provincial towns, it would be found

to send readers to the Bible,—Roman Catholics to our churches, children to our schools, and in the end be a certain means of dissolving that tie between priest and people, which has hitherto presented the principal barrier to every attempt at amelioration or improvement. Whether the person who addresses you, will ever be permitted to take a part in this sacred work or not, He who guides and regulates all things only knows; and with Him, and Him alone, he desires to leave this and all his other concerns.

The Lord, if it so pleased him, could make every beam from the sun convey his influence to the heart, every blade of grass in the field a messenger of truth, and every leaf on the tree a preacher of righteousness—but as he has committed the treasure to earthen vessels, see you, beloved Sirs, that you are faithful to the sacred trust, that you are “steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for as much as ye know that your labor shall not be in vain in the Lord ¶.”

The first of these is the fact that the  
 government has been unable to raise the  
 necessary funds to meet its obligations.  
 This has led to a severe financial crisis  
 and has caused the government to  
 default on its debt. The second is the  
 fact that the government has been unable  
 to reform its tax system. This has led  
 to a severe loss of revenue and has  
 caused the government to default on its  
 debt. The third is the fact that the  
 government has been unable to reform its  
 judicial system. This has led to a  
 severe loss of confidence in the  
 government and has caused the  
 government to default on its debt.

### *THIRD PART.*

---

TO THE

**KING AND HIS MINISTERS,**

UPON

**SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH THE RELIGION OF**

*THE CHURCH OF ROME.*

---

IN a late publication, entitled, "A Correspondence between a Roman Catholic Priest and a Protestant Layman," the author took an opportunity of introducing, amongst other things, an appeal to the King and his Ministers, upon the subject of the idolatry of the Church of Rome; and (as has been already stated in a preceding part of this publication) many persons supposed the appeal was intended to have a political reference<sup>||</sup>; that the King, in place of granting Roman Catholics indulgences, might adopt a system of coercion and restraint, as far as was compatible with personal security, and a perfect freedom of religious worship—but the writer feels it due to himself to say, that such was not his object, and also to state what was; and this latter he humbly conceives becomes every day so additionally import-

---

<sup>||</sup> See Note N.

ant: that he likewise begs leave to make a few remarks upon a subject, which he is persuaded can be borne out by unquestionable fact, and that is:

*That the present insurrection in Ireland, is owing to the existence of the Roman Catholic religion.*

Politics merely, with relation to the present scene of things, are so destitute of all real interest, that for my own part, in place of wishing to write or speak about them, I generally feel most happy when farthest removed from their atmosphere. It is as far as religion, and religion only is concerned, that any thing is really important; it is in that light that every thing was intended to be viewed, and in proportion as things recede from it, in the same proportion they recede from their proper reference. Political states and political constitutions, however excellent their materials, or sound their structure, are but the scaffoldings erected by human agency, for carrying on the purposes of Him who lives and reigns above; and according as these purposes are completed, he causes the same agency to remove or replace the scaffolding; and when the top-stone is laid upon his spiritual building, He will become the glorious and the rightful possessor, and dismiss both the agent and the incumbrance, and that will be when "The kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ, and he will reign for ever and for ever." A time, that we all pray for, when we say, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." A time, that for its importance, our infinitely wise Saviour places first in the order of his creature's supplications. A time, that every event, whether great or small, which occurs in the earth, is hastening the approach of. A time, that no man has any inheritance in the glory of, 'till he has learned unfeignedly to long for; and a time, that when it arrives, will so eclipse the pomp and the pageantry of this transitory scene; the honor of



the hero, the skill of the artist, and the talent of the statesman, that they will be like shadows forgotten, when removed; or as minute receding objects in the vast expanse, imperceptible from their exceeding insignificance.

The idolatry of the Church of Rome was the only subject connected with its doctrines, to which the appeal directed the attention of the King and his Ministers, and with reference to that, L. was, and is of opinion, that means might be adopted for its suppression, consistent with duty on the part of the rulers, and with religious liberty on the part of the people. The measures he particularly had in view were, first, issuing orders through the proper authorities, to our bishops and superior clergy in the country, to direct those filling subordinate places in the church establishment, in their private intercourse and public ministry, to use means for enlightening the minds of the people as much as possible, with respect to the great evil of idolatry, and to point out earnestly and affectionately, in what instances the practice existed, that all persons concerned, might be led to look into their own conduct as it bore upon the case.

Secondly, to issue proclamations on the subject, to be read in all the churches, at some convenient time during divine service, similar to those issued with respect to the observance of the Sabbath-day. A measure that reflected honor upon our King, and did credit to his servants in the state.

Thirdly, to publish proclamations, pointing out where there was reason to fear idolatry existed in the Church of Rome, warning all his Majesty's faithful and loving subjects against the danger of the practice, as hateful to God and injurious to their own temporal and eternal interests; and intreating them to take the thing seriously into consi-

deration. That those proclamations should be faithfully and uncompromisingly drawn up, and inserted in all the newspapers throughout the kingdom; that every man, woman, and child in the community, might have these subjects brought under their notice, be led to examine into their truth or falsehood, and made acquainted with God's commandments, and their duty with regard to them; the only permanent security of a people's welfare or a government's stability.

This would be simply wielding the sword of the spirit; and while it would exalt our Monarch on the one hand, would not be incompatible with his subjects' liberty of conscience on the other. I am aware, however, that in a topic of this sort, there are three species of objectors to be contended with: one is, a description of Protestants who say, 'That though many of the doctrines of the Church of Rome are of an idolatrous nature, yet they do not think Roman Catholics are practical idolators.' I cannot help saying, that if persons making this objection had a little more of the jealousy for God, which He, as the Creator and Governor of all things, justly and wisely entertains for himself, they would not be of this opinion.

To separate the necessary belief of doctrines of an idolatrous nature from idolatry in practice, is what I cannot understand. I say necessary, because any man to be a Roman Catholic, must acknowledge them true—but is there no practical idolatry in the use of images, which the Church of Rome admit, and contend for the use of, and suppress the second commandment in consequence: a commandment which has no other reference but to that particular offence? Is there no practical idolatry in the public elevation of the host, a substance composed of a little flour and water, which the people are required to fall down and worship, often upon

extraordinary occasions, and every day in the service of the Mass? Is there no idolatry in religious prostration before relics? or none in praying to saints? or none in confessing sins to them, which, as has been shown, every person making confession to a popish priest, is taught and required to do? In fact, the religion of the Church of Rome is a system of as deep-rooted idolatry as exists on the face of the earth: and however a few individuals, from motives of pride or interest, may attempt to gloss it over, nineteen parts out of twenty of its professors know or practice nothing better. It is a religion that degrades the Saviour it professes to honor; that reduces the God of heaven and earth to a cypher, less and more insignificant than the lowest of his creatures; and that would leave him without authority, or without homage in the world: and let persons say what they may, this, and this only, has been the chief source of all the evils which for years have debased, degraded, and demoralized this ill-fated country; for it is said, "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people." Prov. xiv. 34. And although it is true, that from the corruption of human nature, wherever man is found associated together, there immorality to a greater or less extent will exist; it is also true, that in whatever country a religion prevails, which in its doctrines or tendency is dishonorable to God, there calamity of various kinds will as certainly prevail, as ill health will proceed from a fetid atmosphere, or darkness be produced by the absence of the sun.

The second species of objectors are those, who say 'that however it may be the duty of rulers, to put down false religion as much as possible in a country, yet the adoption of such measures as are here recommended, would be so likely to stir up a spirit of rancor in the minds of many, that it would be more prudent not to take any steps in the business.' To that I answer; I do not think so. Whatever rancor

might be stirred up would be confined to the few. The knowledge would serve the many; and the consequences of an act, in any case, should never restrain the exercise of *positive* duty, let who or what will be at enmity, God's friendship is more and better than all.

The third description of objectors are those, who think, it is not the duty of rulers expressly to interfere in matters concerning religion, and in consequence, they would be wrong for adopting the measures here proposed; that their duty is to attend merely to the civil and political concerns of those whom they govern, but with regard to spiritual, if they tolerate all religions, they are not called on to establish or interfere with any. To this I also answer, I don't think so. And as the opinion is one which unhappily prevails to a considerable extent, I will take the liberty of dwelling for a little on the subject.

With regard to religious toleration, there should be no question raised against the propriety of it, *on the broadest and most liberal basis upon which it can possibly be established*; for every man has an undoubted right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, none daring to make him afraid—but so far from supposing, that the duty of rulers should be confined to the mere civil and political concerns of the community, I am persuaded these are but secondary objects, and that religion should be the first and chief. The language of our blessed Lord is “Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.” Matt. vi. 33. And I cannot see how that command, and accompanying promise, means one thing when applied to individuals, and another when applied to heads of families, or rulers in a state. Religion also, on the one hand, having a final reference to God; and on the other, being the mainspring, whether true or false, of all human con-

duct, together with the king of a country, being in a special manner the anointed of the Lord, it seems unreasonable and unscriptural; that he should consider himself merely as an agent in subordinate concerns, and not as one, in that which most concerns his own and his people's welfare, and for which he has been particularly vested with his high and sacred authority: and in this sense it is said, "Kings shall be the nursing fathers, and Queens the nursing mothers of the Church." Isa. xlix, 23. And so strongly does this impress itself upon my mind, that I hesitate not to say, that rulers in a country do not do their duty, if they neglect to watch over its religious interests as their first concern; not merely by giving perfect freedom of worship to all—but by making express provision for the spiritual instruction of the people, and making that provision, as is done in our establishment, an integral part of the constitution, the civil part of which, is bound in duty to watch over and protect the religious, and in fact be subservient to it, giving God the first place, and man the second. In order more fully to illustrate this, will any Christian person differing in opinion, say, that the father of a family does his duty, if he satisfy himself by merely giving leave, to all persons who please, to instruct his children upon the subject of religion, without making express provision for that instruction himself? Or will a man, who from inheritance, or any other circumstance, has been placed over five hundred, or five thousand people, do his duty, if he make no express provision for the religious instruction of those under his care? nay, will it not be acknowledged, that if no such provision be made, God will call both one and the other to an account, for abusing a talent with which they had been intrusted? And upon what principle, I ask, can it be different with respect to kings, where the necessity is increased in a much greater proportion? Then some may say, 'If this be case, Mahometan or Roman Catholic kings do right by establishing their religion in the countries under

their authority, and making them an integral part of the state.' Perfectly right, provided they don't interfere with full liberty of conscience, the heaven-born right of every man who breathes: and though the establishment of such delusions are to be lamented, yet it must be understood that the abuse of a good principle is no argument against the principle itself. Others may say, 'If it be the positive duty of rulers to establish a form of worship, what is to be done in republican governments, where the legislative body is composed of men of various religious creeds and sentiments?' I answer, on that account, together with some others, a republican government is an evil to be deplored, as much so as it would be in the case of the father of a family, or the master of a property just mentioned. A mere republican government is of all governments the worst. It seems to be the very reverse of the authority under which it was designed we should live; and if examined, it will be found, that a necessity for any modification of it, only arises from our corrupt state through the fall. Obedience to one head, appears to be the form of legislation intended for man. This we are taught by the government of Him, who is all rule and all authority in himself; a perfect model; and I do believe that the purer men become, and the more his example is made the rule of their conduct, the more they will be desirous of imitating him in this, as well as in every other respect; and in conformity with the principle, it is almost universally acknowledged, that an absolute monarchy is the best possible form of government, when the king is a wise, a humane, and a virtuous man.

Having thus stated what my object was in making the appeal, connected with the Correspondence; and also having endeavoured to answer such objections as appeared likely to be made to the execution of it, I proceed to advert to the last remark:

*That the present insurrection in Ireland, is owing to the existence of the Roman Catholic Religion.*

The state of the lower classes of people in Ireland for years past, has been one of much mental and bodily degradation. The condition of our peasantry, for the most part, has been wretched in the extreme; their clothing ragged and scanty; their diet poor, and often insufficient; and their habitations, in nearly four cases out of five, miserable beyond example; and when persons, particularly those who are unfriendly to the existing government of the country, talk of this subject, they seem to speak as if it were a new thing, or a matter of surprise, and endeavour to account for it, by a non-resident gentry, tithes, taxes, misrule, oppressive political authority, or any other cause their fancy may suggest; forgetting, that when we had an Irish parliament, a resident gentry, and every other advantage, the absence of which is so much deplored, the condition of our poor in general, and our peasantry in particular, was not one whit better than it is at present, or than it has been for ages past; and I therefore maintain, when the present insurrection in Ireland is ascribed to any, or all of the reasons stated, as a sole producing cause; it is not true—but that there is an ulterior one, to which the acknowledged poverty of the people is only secondary, as far as it can be fairly allowed to operate in the case; and that cause, I repeat it again, is THE EXISTENCE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION; a cause, that until struck at, and struck at effectually, the work of revolution will proceed, and every attempt made to better the condition of the country prove nugatory and abortive: a cause, which God himself is about to remove, and that if the King and his Ministers, and Protestants of all denominations, do not own, acknowledge, and honour Him in the performance of, will be productive, there is much reason to fear, of calamity and

bloodshed, beyond what many persons would be willing or disposed to contemplate.

It is well known by those who are acquainted with the prophetical parts of Scripture, that the time allowed for the duration of the Antichristian power of popery, is twelve hundred and sixty years, and that "the beast" mentioned in the first verse of the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, describes that Antichristian power; all Protestants not only universally agree in, but even Roman Catholics themselves, cannot with the slightest pretension to truth and consistency deny, for the marks given of the beast are so decided, as to make it only applicable to Rome, and that it must be Rome papal, and not pagan, the duration of the latter from the period of the prophecy to the destruction of the pagan Roman empire unquestionably decides,|| not being at most, more than 400 years, or less than one third of the duration of 1260 just mentioned. This period of 1260 years, is denoted in the Bible, by the different expressions of "twelve hundred and sixty days," "forty and two months," and "times, time, and half a time," which last, being taken according to prophetical calculation, as signifying two years for "the times," one for "the time," and half a year for "the half a time," makes likewise forty-two months, the second mode of expression, and this, at thirty days for each month, makes twelve hundred and sixty days; thus showing, that each expression is a different mode of pointing out the same duration. The second denomination of "forty and two months," is used with regard to the beast, in the 5th verse of the 13th of Revelation, and the others respectively

---

|| As it would not comport either with the writer's time, or the compass in which he writes, to go into detail on this subject, any persons wishing to inform themselves with regard to it, can do so, by consulting Bishop Newton, or Faber on the Prophecies, or any Scripture commentator of repute, such as Henry, Scott, Doyly and Mante, Patrick and Lowth, and several others.



occur in the following passages, to which persons would do well particularly to refer, Daniel vii. 25. and xii. 7. Rev. xi. 2, 3. xii. 6, 14. That the period of 1260 days here differently pointed out, is to be taken prophetically, a day for a year, and thus making it 1260 years, appears from three similar instances in Scripture, where the events referred to, by such a mode of calculation have been precisely fulfilled. One is the 9th of Rev. and 10th verse, where is foretold the rise of Mahomet, and the progress of his successors, ruling over the Arabians or Saracens. "And they had tails like unto scorpions, and there were stings in their tails; and their power was to hurt men five months." On this passage Bishop Newton makes the following remark:—"If these months be taken for prophetic months, or 150 years, it was within that space of time the Saracens made their principal conquest. Their greatest exploits were performed between the year 612, when Mohammed first *opened the bottomless pit*, and began publicly to teach and propagate his imposture, and the year 762, when the Caliph Almansor built Bagdad, to fix there the seat of his empire, and called it *the city of peace*." Again, in the future conquests of the Turks, foretold in the 15th verse of the same chapter, "And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men," the same able writer has the following remarks:—"There were four principal sultanies or kingdoms of the Turks, bordering upon the river Euphrates: Bagdad, Damascus, Aleppo, and Iconium in Asia Minor. The hour, day, month and year, taken prophetically, amounts to 391 years and 15 days. Now it is wonderfully remarkable, that the first conquest mentioned in history, of the Othmans over the Christians, was in the year of Christ 1281. Compute 391 years from that time, and they will terminate in the year 1672, and in that year Mohammed IV. took Cameniec from the *Poles*, and forty-

eight towns and villages were delivered up to the Sultan upon the treaty of peace; whereupon Prince Cantemir hath made this memorable reflection: 'This was the last victory by which any advantage accrued to the Othman states, or any city or province was annexed to the ancient bounds of the empire.' And if more accurate and authentic histories of the Othmans were brought to light, the like exactness might also be found in the fifteen days." The third instance, is in the 9th of Daniel, and 24th verse, in the remarkable prophecy of the crucifixion of Christ, which was there said, would take place within seventy weeks from a stated period. Seventy weeks make 490 days, and a day for a year 490 years, and according to the time thus expressed in the prediction, that solemn event took place.||

With respect to the period of 1260 years allowed for the existence of popery, it is not perhaps in the power of any person to fix the precise time when it commenced; nor most probably will it be known until its termination declares the time of its beginning. Some have computed it from A.D. 533, when the Emperor Justinian gave to the Bishop of Rome the title of Head of the Holy Churches. Others, from 606, when the Emperor Phocas made Boniface universal bishop. Others, from 755, when the pope became a temporal prince, by receiving the exarchate of Ravenna; and others, at times differently intermediate from the three. In the note referred to, a little on, I take the liberty of saying a few words with respect to these different opinions, to which if the reader refer, he will perceive, that neither the first or third can be correct, and that 606, or probably some few years prior to it, is most likely to be the true time for commencing the computation. However, when I state the present insurrection in Ireland to be owing to the existence of the Roman Catholic religion, I do not rest the statement upon

---

|| See Faber's Dissertation on the Seventy Weeks.

an uncertain calculation of this kind—but upon the signs of the times as they at present manifest themselves, in conjunction with the double fact, of a limited period being allowed in Holy Writ for the duration of the papal Antichristian power,|| and the certain ground ordinary calculation affords, for believing a termination of that period to be very near.

Those three circumstances united, will not I think leave the mind of any unprejudiced person in doubt, with respect to the truth of the statement. The signs of the times generally, are too numerous, remarkable, and uniform, to come within the compass of mere ordinary events, and any persons disposed to look at them only in that view, or otherwise treat them with lightness, should take care, lest they incur a charge similar to that made by Christ upon the Pharisees, “O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky, but can ye not discern the signs of the times?” Mat. xvi. 3. Or narrowing the view, we may reasonably claim assent from professing Christians, who overlooking prophetic testimony, consider popery in the *mistaken* light, of a mere system of error, likely to be affected in common with other false religions of the day, by the exertions which for the past ten or fifteen years have been making for the general interests of religion. Such, however, as well as those who take the more enlarged and correct view of the subject, will not, I am sure, upon examination, in either case refuse to acknowledge, that it is the approaching conclusion of the time allotted for Antichrist is now covering the Turkish empire with consternation and with war; that has engendered and is maturing in Spain the spirit of revolution, which prevails in that long degraded country; a country, in which nothing short of a total renovation, will ever effect a removal, of the destructive poi-

---

|| And the Mahometan too, though my purpose don't make it necessary to advert to the subject.

son with which popery has envenomed its vitals; a country where murder is an act of devotion, and crime the obedience of faith. That it is the same approaching conclusion has revolutionized Portugal; has given freedom to the South American colonies; is filling the Italians with a spirit for liberty; that will in all probability by and by extend itself to Austria; that is at this moment leading to a rupture of a serious, and perhaps sanguinary nature, in France; and finally, is disturbing our unhappy country, and likely materially to affect those parts of it where the Roman Catholic religion most generally prevails. With respect to the latter, in further corroboration of the statement, it seems impossible for any person to look at the aspect of the present insurrectionary spirit amongst the lower orders, and not be struck with two or three features connected with it, which seem strongly to bear upon the point. The commencement of a revolution, is generally effected by the design and vicious industry of persons in the better walks of life—but this, as far as has appeared, don't seem to have been the case, on the contrary, it manifested itself at a moment, when peace and conciliation was the order of the day. Revolutionists generally have some preconcerted plan to act upon, and a distinct object to effect—but in Ireland the peasantry seem to be going to fight they know not whom, and to obtain they know not what. As far too as the tumultuary spirit has unfolded itself, religion has evidently been connected with its proceedings; as burning and destroying churches and glebe-houses, and other acts, indicative of a similarly hostile feeling to the established religion of the country.

Having thus endeavoured to make good my principle, the truth of which I feel satisfied will become more and more evident every day, I take the liberty of saying, that when a deep-rooted system, like that of popery, is about to be destroyed; a system which for twelve hundred and sixty years

has been entwining itself around the fibres of society; which has the superstition, the ignorance, and the bigotry of its professors, together with the energy and powers of Satan combined for its support: an adversary who will not let so large a portion of his territory go, without defending every step, and mustering in hostile and well-armed array, all the persecution, ill-will, and bad feeling he can possibly collect to bear upon his cause; when this system, I say, is about to be destroyed, it would be unreasonable to suppose the work will be effected without much tearing asunder, and painful calamities of various kinds; and there is but one way of lessening those calamities, or peradventure, through the blessing of the Lord, in a great measure preventing them, and that is, by Protestants of all denominations, and the King and Government of the country, in church and state, coming forward "to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty:" coming forward to own and stand by him in the performance of this great work. In the performance of destroying a system, which every lover of light, of liberty, or of knowledge, in the world, should rejoice at the destruction of; a system which has set the God of heaven and earth at defiance; that has opposed his truth, stripped him of his authority, hid and misrepresented his word, and put thousands to death, who were precious to him as "the apple of his eye." God deserves this mark of respectful attention; England particularly owes it to him. 'Tis He has fought her battles, guided her fleets, and directed her councils. 'Tis He has brought her safely and honorably over the troubled waters, of a long and an arduous contest; and that by power, by watchfulness, and wisdom, has safely moored her in a harbour of security and peace. Yea, and for his own sake, what besides does he not deserve! for he is a good God, and a merciful, a compassionate father, a faithful protector, and a never-failing Friend. Infinitely wise, infinitely holy, infinitely just, infinitely wonderful, a God to whom the unreserved homage

of our affections, and the zealous devotedness of our lives, should be only the performance of a reasonable service, and the pleasing tribute of a grateful love.

In conclusion, I conjure the Government of the country to take this subject into their serious consideration. Let them appoint pious, well qualified men, to examine into the Bible with regard to it; and if they find the predictions of that Holy Book correspond with the signs of the times just mentioned, let them take a decided stand; let them put into practice the means already adverted to, with such others as our good King may deem expedient; it will give the people to see, that the religion they have been taught to believe, is false and delusive; it will awaken suspicion with respect to their priests, whose dues and continued demands they feel oppressive, and would be glad, if possible, to shake off; it will set them about inquiring, and by degrees turn their attention from the disgraceful objects which at present occupy their minds; and in the end, attach them to the church and constitution they are at present arming themselves against.||

Let the Government also discontinue their annual grant to Maynooth College; if not suddenly, at least by gradual reductions; a grant that only tends to uphold a system ruinous to the best interests of the country, and the original bestowment of which, I am bold to say, was as inconsistent with Christian principle, as with sound or judicious policy; and these measures, steadily and faithfully pursued, will, there is every reason to hope, bring the Most High upon our side, who honors them that honor Him, and stands by them that stand by Him. With such an aid, we have nothing to fear, without it, every thing to dread; calamity, desolation, and woe, which may God avert, for his great Name and Mercies sake, Amen.†

---

# NOTES.

---

## NOTES.

---

### A.

**THIS** passage, in the Rhemish Testament, is rendered, “ what is that to me and to thee?” which, in some respects, alters the very adverse nature of the reply—but those who translated it thus, ought to have known, it was not right to do so: the words used are *Τί μοι καὶ σοί*; which is a Greek idiom, and in heathen authors, as well as in the scriptures, always translated according to the authorised version; and there is a case occurs in the Bible, where it would be impossible to render it otherwise; as in the 8th of Luke, and 28th, where the devil says to Christ, “ what have I to do with thee,” it is the same idiom is used here; and this circumstance, amongst many others, serves to show, how little veneration Roman Catholics really have for the sacred writings, when they can thus make an improper use of passages to suit their own unjustifiable purposes.

### B.

As the nature of the subject under discussion obliges me to view it in this abstract, and in some respects not the most pleasing way—I should be sorry any person would be led to suppose, from the circumstance, that I wish to undervalue the important event of our Lord’s incarnation, or the high honor conferred upon Mary, by her being the chosen vessel, in which the Redeemer of mankind was pleased to clothe himself with his fleshly taber-



nacle—No, it was a high honor; and were it not so abused, much might be said upon it: and those who love Christ most, and in consequence wish to take least from his glory, will best be able safely to enter into Mary's feelings, when she said, "Behold all generations shall call me blessed." And as this little remark gives me an opportunity of saying a word or two. I cannot forbear observing, that there is something not a little interesting, in connecting the idea of a woman being the occasion of the fall, and afterwards being made instrumental in delivering mankind from its consequences, by the incarnation of Christ. The woman seduced Adam, and afterwards, as it were, entreats him to return. Thus a curse, which was originally given for a blessing, is, by means of the Messiah, reinstated in its proper place. It is the same blessed Messiah who must reinstate all things, and in his incarnation, like a wise master-builder, he appears to begin with that which first occasioned the derangement. The female character is placed upon very elevated ground in the Bible. The strongest instances of love shown to our Lord while on earth, were manifested by women; and when his mind in return, seemed to exercise some of its sweetest tenderness, it was directed towards them. When the believer is represented as in a fit state to appear before Christ—it is in the character of a chaste virgin; and when the Church is represented as cleansed and purified from all its defilement, it is under the figure of a bride adorned for the bridegroom. For my own part, in a general way, I believe women are intended by God, to be representatives on earth of what angels are in heaven. Angels first fell—so did the woman; angels first announced the news of our Lord's birth—a woman was made the instrument of it: a woman tempted the first Adam—an angel tempted the second, in the person of Christ; angels especially ministered to our Lord—so did women; angels contribute to the glory of God—so "Man is not the glory of the woman, but the woman the glory of the man;" angels veil their faces in the presence of the Most High—so it is said, "the woman ought to have power (or a covering) on her head, because of the angels." 1 Cor. xi. 10. And thus considered, this passage of scripture, upon which so much has been said and written, appears as simple as any in the Bible. Angels are represented as the messengers of God's mercy and kindness—so women are the

sources of enjoyment and comfort in the different relations of social life : from them

“Tenderness is doubly entended, and every endearment enriched.”

And as angels are employed to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation, it is not the least gratifying circumstance in the feature of the present times, to see females employed in ways and purposes connected with the diffusion of religious knowledge; for which the author of all good has peculiarly adapted, and no doubt originally designed them. As the love of Christ increases in the heart, and extends itself in the world, we have every reason to believe, the nature of the female character will be better understood, and that in proportion as the Church draws near the consummation of its blessedness, the procedure will be in a great degree marked by an increase of the spirit, which is now so happily manifesting itself, of employing women in the more active purposes of religious duty, and of giving them that place, which it unquestionably appears from the Bible is intended they should occupy. Having ventured to make those few remarks, I hope my beloved female friends will allow me to say, in my own behalf, that I do not hold up this glass, that the vanity, natural to the human heart, may be gratified by looking at the reflection; No,—and I can only wish, that one better worthy of their attention, and less undeserving their regard, would remove the pen from my hand, and give effect to the observations by a practically suitable conclusion. Remember, dear friends, that the worst of evils is a perverted good. Live in the consciousness of your own intended usefulness. You are weak—Christ, the husband of the Church, is strong; avail yourself, as much as possible, of his company; go to him frequently in prayer, there is an exquisite tenderness in his character that will not slight the tenderness of yours; you are emblems of the Church he died to redeem; he knows it, and will feel for you; make him your care-taker and your guardian, and all will go well; angels are messengers of mercy—you are their emblems; they veil their faces before God, and are, in a figure, to Him, what you are to man; their employment is kindness—is yours? Do your husbands feel it? Do your children feel it? Do your relatives? your

domestics? or the indigent or the ignorant in your neighbourhood? if not, you are out of your proper place—the emblem is not suitable—something wants to be repaired—neglect it not, lest it go too far. Jesus is the only physician, no case beyond the power of his skill; every complaint sent to him, goes to its proper place. Think of this, and may the Father of mercies, and God of all grace, give you his blessing, for Christ the Redeemer's sake.—Amen.

## C.

However far the fact of God's being every where present at the same time, may be, and is above our comprehension, that, as well as most of the attributes of his character, seem clearly discernible from corresponding properties in his creature man. "Man was made in God's image, and after his likeness;" and perhaps the difficulties, with which most people seem to think an accurate understanding, with respect to the Divine character, is surrounded, would be in a considerable degree lessened, if we were to judge of it by the simple means which he himself has been pleased to give us in connexion with our own creation. God is an infinite Being, and clothed with wonders; but is it not possible, by contemplating things as they are, that we may arrive at much *certain* knowledge with respect to facts belonging to his existence? but particularly so in the minute examination of a creature, whom he has told us, as already mentioned, he has made "in his own image, and after his likeness." To comprehend the nature of God's existence is impossible, and all that we can at any time attain to, with regard to him, is to know that he is what he declares himself to be; and in no case has he, nor would he, as a just God, require us to believe any specific declaration with regard to himself, without giving us ample evidence of its truth, if we properly avail ourselves of it.

And we are not to doubt the nature of God's Being, as he has been pleased to make it known to us, because we cannot comprehend it; for if so, we will doubt every thing, because we can really comprehend nothing. The greatest variety of knowledge, and the utmost possible extent of it to which any person can attain,

will never reach, in the slightest instance, beyond a simple knowledge of facts. That things are so and so, is all we can arrive at, but to comprehend how they are so, and upon what principle, does not fall within the compass of the human understanding: for instance, I know that such a tree derives its nourishment from the earth, and that that nourishment passes through its vessels, and produces such and such leaves and fruit. I may know the various chymical and medicinal properties of those fruit and leaves, but my knowledge must stop there, it will not reach beyond these simple facts. Again, I know that food nourishes the body, that it divides itself into various substances, that one goes to one purpose in the animal system, and another to another—but how, or upon what principle this internal process is carried on, or how the effects arising from it are produced, I cannot tell—my knowledge will not extend further than the acquirement of simple facts. So it is with regard to the Divine Being; that he is what he is, is all we can know respecting him—but how, or upon what principle he is so, we cannot tell,

A principle corresponding to God's omnipresence, the subject which led to those remarks, will be found to exist in a very minute degree in man: he can be mentally present in more places than one at the same time; and the different affections of his mind, such as love, knowledge, joy, or sorrow, can be brought into exercise by causes which he is certain exist, though proceeding from places very remote from one another, and where, though absent in body, he may be considered as being spiritually present. An abstruse subject of this kind would require much time and space, to be treated as it ought, and my reason for adverting to it at all, was, in order to say a word or two upon the trinity of the Godhead, and the incarnation of Christ, both of which seem capable of deriving much proof from the nature of man's existence. Man's existence has been always referred to as an illustration of the trinity; and there is nothing so inexplicable that should not, upon Divine testimony, receive implicit credit in the fact of the Godhead consisting of three distinct essences, each possessing the properties of the other, and yet composing one God. With respect to the incarnation, persons who deny the Divinity of our Lord, have

said, how could a God be on earth, in the person of Christ, and another God be in heaven, and yet there be but one God? And if Christ were God, and there be but one, to whom did he address himself when he cried upon the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This species of gainsaying has led many a poor soul astray—but I would ask the person using it, to whom does the Psalmist address himself when he says, "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me bless his holy name." Was David here calling upon himself; or, because he used this language, must there be necessarily two Davids? Or if he were under acute suffering of body or mind, and felt his spirit forsaking him; a spirit by which he had been cheered and sustained under previous circumstances of adversity, and exclaimed in consequence, Oh David be thyself, my man, my man, why hast thou forsaken me? Would there be any thing improper in this? Or must there be necessarily two Davids, to warrant him using such language? No, it is not only allowable, but the very expression denotes an intenseness of agony, which should call forth the tenderest sympathy of the heart—and what will persons who deny the divinity of our adorable Lord say, when it appears they not only refuse him the exercise of this sympathy—but turn the very evidence of his suffering into a plea for robbing him of his glory? Beware, O sinner, whosoever thou art, that sayest, Jesus of Nazareth is not Jehovah!

There is nothing inconsistent in saying, that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet that there are not three Gods but one God. As far as an abstract subject of this kind is capable of being illustrated, might we not suppose a government with the supreme authority vested in three persons, and each of those persons the exact counterpart of the other; the same in disposition; the same in capacity; each necessary to the existence of the other; one in interest; one in object; one in affection; what one did, all did; what one wished, all wished; what one felt, all felt; and thus it might with propriety be said, the first is king; the second is king; and the third king; and yet there are not three kings but one king. The first is supreme; the second is supreme; and the third supreme; and yet there are not

three supremes but one supreme. The first is to be obeyed ; the second is to be obeyed ; and the third to be obeyed ; and yet there are not three to be obeyed but one to be obeyed. From such an illustration as this having an unavoidable reference to man, who is impure and corporal, it loses much of the force it otherwise would have, but in relation to the Godhead we are to remember, that the persons are pure and incorporeal ; pure, and therefore incapable of erring ; incorporeal, and therefore capable of union. Hence, if the three persons mentioned as forming the supreme government, were divested of body, and consisted only of spirit, as the Godhead does, not having any obstructing medium to prevent a perfect blending together, might they not become one, and three, and one again ; uniting, and disuniting, and reuniting, when, and where, and how they pleased, as we know air, fire, or vapor, in the natural world are capable of doing ? Divide any one, or all of which, and each division possesses all the qualities, and is a perfect similitude of the other : thus it may be said with respect to the Trinity. The first is every where present ; the second every where present ; and the third every where present. The first is all-powerful ; the second all-powerful ; and the third all-powerful. The first is infinitely wise ; the second infinitely wise ; and the third infinitely wise—and so on, through all the attributes of the divine character. The Church of England wisely lays much stress upon the doctrine of the Trinity, properly considering, that no person can be regarded as a Christian, who does not at least practically know it to be true.

---

In addition to the above, I beg to remark, that God's final object in every thing is his own glory ; or rather, to speak more correctly, every thing he does has that certain tendency : as separate from intention or otherwise, it unfolds a character of infinite and unspotted loveliness ; and persons have said, with respect to this truth, is it not incompatible with the character of the Divine Being, to suppose, that his own glory would be the final object of all he does ? Would not such a principle, in a human creature, be justly considered an unamiable one ? and why should we think that God would act from no higher a motive ? As the mind of man naturally hates

God, it is to this source, and this only, that such an objection can be traced—for in proportion as we dislike others, we are unwilling to give them honor; and as we love others, in the same proportion do we not only feel an interest in their credit—but are anxious to seek out opportunities by which we may increase and extend it, and without their being aware, often silently throw those opportunities in their way, that we may be gratified by witnessing the result. It is to the production of this principle that converting grace directs itself. Before; man is an objector to God's glory, as unreasonable: After; the promotion of it is his highest enjoyment and greatest desire—but when we say, it is an unamiable principle for men to act with a view to their own glory, it should be remembered, that what constitutes it such, is the duty they owe to their equals, a duty founded upon the divine law, which requires them "In honor to prefer one another:" and in that point of view we have this reciprocal honor and self-denial beautifully manifested in the conduct of the persons of the God-head, with regard to each other, the only relationship which can afford any thing of a parallel with respect to the state of man. The Father loves the Son, he is his *well* beloved; yet he denies himself and gives him up, that he may be honored by accomplishing the work of man's redemption. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son." John iii. 16. The Son came into the world, that the Father might be glorified in him. "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." John iv. 34. The Holy Ghost speaks not of himself, but proceeds from the father, and testifies of the Son. John xv. 26. Hence, with regard to the first and second, shortly before Christ suffered, "He lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come: glorify *thy* Son, that *thy* Son also may glorify *thee*:" and again, "I have glorified *thee* on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." John xvii. 1, 4 & 5. And with reference to the spirit it is said, "When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of *himself*; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He shall *glorify* me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of

mine and shall show it unto you." John xvi. 13, 14 & 15. Here is the Father glorifying the Son, the Son the Father, and the Holy Spirit both—but when this distinction of persons ceases, and we view them in the existence of one God; then there is no equal, no superior, and in that character God may be considered manifesting his glory as a powerful, affectionate, and gracious monarch would do for the honor and advantage of his subjects—and which glory, if the subjects love their monarch, they would in return be scrupulously jealous of for his sake. Hence God's glory, and man's credit, are, and will be for ever, inseparably united. And if we feel no interest in the former, it is because we want the love essential to its existence.

## D.

As the practice in Maynooth, with regard to the Virgin Mary, has been adverted to, I beg leave also to mention, that the host is carried about there with great form and ceremony, on the same festivals as it is in Roman Catholic countries; and upon those occasions many of the inmates not only kneel, but prostrate themselves, in the most reverential manner, on the ground. The evening before the day upon which this ceremony takes place, the host is generally consecrated: and it may not be uninteresting to some to mention, that from the time of its consecration, to the commencement of the procession, next day, the flour and water lies in great state, and two of the students, dressed in white surplices, and on their knees before it, are placed to watch it; and lest weariness should break in upon their vigilance, they are relieved every hour by two more, from a number kept in waiting for that purpose. This is a service of great importance, for the object of their care, with all its attributes, is such a defenceless kind of commodity, that if any were ill-disposed enough to make free with it, and talk afterwards of their mischief, there would be great danger of bursting a bubble, which Satan has too deep an interest in, to let be broken, as long as he can exercise the power of keeping it together. When one thinks of the imposing solemnity which is thrown round this business, perhaps it is impossible for the mind to conceive of any thing more deeply idolatrous, or



more artfully designed, to lead the mind away from the simple and genuine worship of the one living and true God.

## E.

Persons who do not believe in the doctrine of Christ's atonement may say here, and often have said, 'Is it not irreconcilable with God's justice to suppose, that he would cause an innocent victim to suffer for the transgressions of others? I answer, No. May not a man suffer in his property, by paying the debts of others, to release them from confinement? May not a man suffer in his health, by contributing to the recovery of those who were sick and in distress? Or, may not a man lose his life, in order to rescue those who were in imminent danger of losing theirs? And would there be any thing unjust in all this? The debtors might have brought themselves into that situation by extravagance; those who were sick, from intemperance; or those who were in danger, from unjustifiable incaution—but these very circumstances, in place of taking from the credit of the man who delivered them, would immeasurably increase it. If the person who suffered in his property, his health, or his life, were a willing sufferer; if he were the only son of a tender and affectionate parent, who though he loved him, through the great humanity of his heart, parted with him willingly for the purpose, what would you think in such a case, if the persons who were benefitted by the kindness of the father, and by the kindness of the son, in place of acknowledgements of grateful affection, were to charge the one with an act of injustice, in allowing the other to suffer in their stead? Could any adequate expression be found for conduct so gross? and yet, Reader, if you be one, who unhappily makes the objection, you see in the picture but a very faint representation of your own exceeding criminality.

## F.

Though the copiousness of this subject has prevented me confining the slight sketch given of it to the compass, the circumstances under which I write in a great measure require, I cannot

entirely pass over unnoticed the doctrine of human merit, or rather demerit, upon which it has led me so closely to touch. What is usually understood by human merit, as entitling man to reward in a future state, in *any* way in which it can be viewed, is utterly inconsistent with the religion of Christ. Situated as man is with regard to God, no such thing *possibly* can be; because, look at him under what circumstances you please, and his aspect is that of an offender: and with such, the idea of reward, on any ground of merit, cannot for a moment be associated. All men professing to believe the Christian religion, however imperfect their views may be with regard to it, must acknowledge "that they have done what they ought not, and left undone what they ought to have done:" and how can such entertain the idea of reward? The different relations in which man is placed, with regard to God, seem to merge into two—that of children and servants; children by right of creation, and servants by right of obedience. Hence God says, "A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honor? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts, &c." Mal. i. 6. Now, keeping in mind what man must confess himself to be, let us judge of the case, by transferring it analogically to similar relationships in common life. Could that father reward his child, or that child expect any reward, on the ground of merit from his father, who even though what might be called, in ordinary language, a good child, yet was a transgressor once a day, once a week, or even once a month; and who, though forgiven and warned not to do so again, yet did so again notwithstanding? assuredly not.—Could that master reward his servant, or the servant expect any reward from his master, who though he was in general attentive, yet sometimes neglected his business, sometimes acted proudly and unbecomingly his station, and often manifested considerable indifference under kindness or rebuke? most assuredly not; and how, I ask, can men expect from God, under characters ten thousand fold worse, what, upon no principle of right, they would feel called on to do themselves? Is the law of God, or the justice of God, inferior to the law of man, or the justice of man? Such views of the Divine Being, whether men believe it or not;

ate dishonorable to him in the extreme. Persons shift themselves from under an argument of this kind in two ways: one says, God is very merciful, and we should not judge of him as men judge of one another. To such I answer, why not? Are there two kinds of justice? Is merit and reward one thing when applied to God, and another when applied to man? No—the principle must be the same; and it is only by maintaining a unity of principle, that in such a case, any conclusion can be arrived at: besides, God's mercy in the concern of man's salvation, centres in the gift of Christ; and any person talking of merit and reward, virtually opposes this mercy, and condemns himself. Another says, is not the doctrine of rewards spoken of in the Bible? It is. And does not the term reward necessarily imply merit? No—The Bible says, “He plentifully rewardeth the proud doer:” and reward, in ordinary conversation, may be, and frequently is, used merely to denote cause and consequence, as proceeding from the fixed laws of things: such as, happy is the man who riseth early, for he will be rewarded with good health; happy is the man who lives temperately, for he will have the reward of a good constitution; and in this sense, ten of the first twelve verses of the fifth of Matthew are to be taken, which many persons in consequence of the mode of expression, have been led to form a wrong opinion respecting. The merits of Christ, and Christ only, will save the sinner. Merit for himself he has, nor can have none. Oh! you poor souls, who are practising rigid austerities, going through painful fastings, long prayers, and multiplied self-mortifications, with a view of atoning for your offences, and obtaining pardon from God, look at “the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free:” know ye, Sirs, you are doing not only what God has not asked—but what is even displeasing in his sight; you are dishonoring Christ, by trying to pay a debt which he has already paid, and the unalterable word of truth is, “Believe in Him, and thou shalt be saved.”

## G.

The use of what is called holy water, is much more general amongst Roman Catholics than many persons conceive. The

writer some time ago was in a country place, not very far from the capital, where he went into a cabin by the road side, along with a person who was with him, and had occasion to call there; and the woman who owned the place, in conversation, mentioned the case of one in her neighbourhood, who a short time before had died so suddenly as not to leave time to send for the priest; and as she was apprehensive lest her husband, who was in a delicate state of health, should be carried off in a similar way, she said she mentioned her fears to the priest, and he had given her a bottle of *holy water*, to use in case there was not time to send for him, and that every thing would be quite safe. The poor woman had the water carefully locked up, and seemed much pleased with the expedient. Only think, Reader, what a system of practical evil must arise from delusive inventions of this kind, to quiet the alarms of natural conscience: and this instance is but one, out of thousands of atrocious deceptions of various kinds, practiced in the country every day. There are many parts of Ireland where heads of families supply themselves with this water, and at certain seasons of the year, sprinkle themselves, and their houses, and children with it. In many cases it is made an article of sale, an object Roman Catholic clergy seldom forget. It is well known, that the oil used in extreme unction, produces no small part of the annual income of popish bishops. Formerly they used to sell it to the priests in quantities equal to about half a thimble full, for five or six and twenty shillings, which the priest afterwards retailed out at considerable profit ||. But as most commodities have been advanced in price since, it is not likely they have been backward in raising theirs. Poor sinners have reason to be thankful, that God has reserved "the blood which cleanseth from all sin," in his own hands, for if he had given it for disposal, to those successors of Christ and his apostles, as they call themselves, many no doubt would be badly off.

## H.

Roman Catholics endeavour to justify the practice of Saint worship on the ground of humility, by saying, "when we feel the infinite distance there is between God and us, together with

---

|| See Meagher's Popish Mass, p. 315.

our own unworthiness, can there be any impropriety in asking those to approach Him on our behalf, who are better deserving of the privilege than we are ourselves?" Satan, who is always fertile in excuses, deceives man by such a plea as this—for in place of the practice denoting any thing of Christian humility, it denotes a mind at enmity with God. The language of the Bible, with reference to Christ is, that "we have not an high priest, which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come *boldly* unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Heb. iv. 15 & 16. And when the soul has been taught in any measure to love Christ, it would not dishonor him, or undervalue its own privilege so much, as in a single instance to pray for the intercession of all the martyrs, apostles, or evangelists that ever lived.

## I.

Though we have reason to be thankful, the excellent laws of our land do not give Roman Catholics the liberty of using the same instruments of terror here, which have been in use elsewhere; yet there are few who do not know, that in most cases, if a Roman Catholic change his religious profession, he becomes exposed to a severe species of annoyance and persecution; such as personal reproach and insult, loss of family esteem, or business, if he be in a trade capable of being affected by the change. A short time since, a pious and useful gentleman in the west of Ireland, was mentioning to another, the case of a man in his neighbourhood, who in consequence of abandoning popery from a conviction of its errors, was so persecuted that he was obliged to leave the town where he lived, and when occasion required, could only venture into it under cover of the night; and as a little account of what led to his change may not be uninteresting, I shall give it as the gentleman mentioned it. The place where the man lived was one of very considerable Roman Catholic population, and a priest there being a little more zealous than his companions, contended in his chapel, at different times, against certain articles of Protestant faith; this led the man to look into the subject, and when he examined the passages of scripture referred to by the priest, he ap-

prehended they had not been brought forward correctly; it excited fears, and he determined to go to the parish Minister in his neighbourhood, and ask him which he thought was the true religion. The Minister impressed upon his mind, that as a sinner, the chief subject for him to be informed upon was, what he should do to be saved. The man seemed to think so too; and when he went away he got a number of sheets of paper, and having written at the head of each, what must I do to be saved? left one with every priest in the place, requesting an answer to the question. In a few days afterwards he called, and when he collected all the papers, brought them to the Minister for his opinion. Some of them directed fastings, others prayers, others penances and chapel attendances, and each according to the mind of the person who answered the question—but not one gave him the Bible reply to a similar inquiry, “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” To this the Minister directed the man’s attention, and from considering the nature of faith, as a means of salvation, and comparing it with the doctrines the Church of Rome required him to believe, he became by degrees so enlightened as to renounce its tenets, and has since proved a zealous and devoted Christian.

## K.

There are, no doubt, many exceptions to this latter remark: I have myself perceived much improvement in that way, and hope it will daily become more manifest. Amongst such a numerous body as the Roman Catholic Clergy, there are, it is certain, not a few of amiable dispositions, and many natural good qualities; and it is a pity, that in looking at the disgusting nature of popery, one is unavoidably obliged to associate characters with it, whom nature and education never adapted for so degrading a connexion.

## L.

Any person reading the Correspondence, may perceive the difference of style here alluded to, and I take this opportunity of stating, that the charge Respondens makes in a note on page 3, can only be attributed to the same spirit which dictated the other unbecoming parts of his book. A reference to page 77 of the Cor-

respondence, will show, that I gave an intimation to C. of my intention of publishing, nearly as soon as I formed it; and since C. received the direct communication to that effect, I have had a letter from him, in which he does not express any thing even of displeasure, not to say breach of confidence at the act. All names, dates and places were suppressed, and the subjects entirely of a public nature.

## M.

In addition to the plan recommended here, I should be glad, for my own part, to see formed in Dublin; a Society for the conversion of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. I cannot see any reasonable objection to it, more than a society for the conversion of the Heathen, or the Jews—a society which would publicly, temperately, and affectionately pursue measures for exciting discussion, promoting lectures, circulating information, and that would adopt such other means as might be suitable to the furtherance of its designs.

## N.

Though in the Appeal I had not even a reference to the long agitated question of “Catholic Emancipation;” as the word politics has been mentioned here, I cannot refrain from stating, what suggests itself to my mind upon the subject, particularly as it is one, nearly connected with the interests of religion in Britain and Ireland.

*First*, Men have no *natural* claim whatever, upon the participation of privileges, relating merely to place, power, and emolument, to which what is called “Catholic emancipation” mainly, if not altogether, refers. If the principle were admitted, it would go to overturn all law, and all authority; and a hundred men might, upon its foundation, be very clamorous about slavery and injustice, if the owner of an estate on which they lived, refused to give them a share in its management and its produce.

*Secondly*, The question confining its reference thus, is one of almost as little importance as any the legislature could discuss, for when represented as involving the interests of several millions, it is a mere illusion, as it would not bring actual benefit to one in five hundred of the number.

*Thirdly*, Men have no right to look for liberty from others, who deny it themselves. Roman Catholics refuse the liberty of private judgment, an act of spiritual injustice and oppression, beyond any political rigor that ever was exercised—to say that men, who are to account for themselves, are not to think for themselves! Upon what principle can persons who maintain and defend such a doctrine, arraign the conduct of our rulers, even admitting it was what they say?

*Fourthly*, It is well known, Roman Catholics look to the period of the Reformation, as one pregnant with calamity to their religion; and in a constitution like the British, where church and state are united, how can men avowing, and *obliged* to avow, principles hostile to the former, be permitted to take a part in its management or direction? It would be an anomaly that could not be allowed to exist; a departure from all ordinary maxims of reason or propriety.

*Fifthly*, With much respect for the good sense and ability of his Majesty's Ministers, I take the liberty of saying, that this question should not be entertained for a single moment. Roman Catholics looking for emancipation is a perversion of the order of things. Emancipation rests with themselves, and not with the Government; their system is a lie; they cannot prove or defend it—a lie deeply injurious to the moral and political interests of the country, and if they choose to adhere to it, they suffer, and suffer without remedy. “Emancipate yourselves gentlemen,” Ministers may say. “Emancipate yourselves; you make a mistake in petitioning as you do; renounce your errors, and then the arms of the state are open to receive you; but until then, duty, reason, and the nature of the constitution forbid your obtaining what you seek.

Persons who advocate this measure may be divided into two classes:—

*Those who do it from self-interest; and*  
*Those who do it from principle.*

And I have no hesitation in saying, that notwithstanding all Roman Catholics have said upon the subject, and the odium



they have endeavoured to throw upon those who wished to maintain inviolate the constitution in church and state, that if the former were separated from the bulk of their friends, the latter would be very small: and the chief reasons they assign for adopting the course they do, seem to be "necessity and expediency;" necessity, in order to produce peace in the country, by removing one of the chief causes of faction and discontent: and expediency, "for grant Roman Catholics their request," say they, "and it will tend to soften and eventually remove, their religious prejudices; the former by giving them an opportunity of feeling associated with the interests of the state, and the latter by increasing their intercourse with men of liberal and enlarged views, from whom they would be likely to derive advantage." But with respect to the first, I answer, that so far from the measure producing peace, it would be much more likely to lead to the opposite result. The bare circumstance of Roman Catholics being qualified to fill high places of trust under the crown, would distract the Government, and lay a foundation for jealousies which might be of the most unpleasant consequences in the country. A Roman Catholic expectant appointed to a place, to the exclusion of a Protestant, or a Protestant appointed, to the exclusion of a Catholic—who does not see what feeling would be likely to arise from such a discrepancy of interest? Again, at times of public elections, particularly for Members of Parliament, Protestant and Roman Catholic interest would be so arrayed against one another, that there would be every reason to apprehend a ferment of feeling, which no intervening quiet would be able effectually to subside. And with respect to expediency,

First, *It, like every thing else, must have a boundary; and*

Secondly, *In no case will it ever justify a departure from duty.*

With regard to the first, without meaning any thing disrespectful to Roman Catholics, but merely for illustration, the principle not having a limit would be destructive of all associations of virtue, education, or honesty, in the common intercourse of life. Prudence would require, that before persons of an opposite kind could be admitted into such Society, they must give evidence of changed habits. A number of persons in this country will often

be restrained in free conversation by the presence of a single Roman Catholic, though it be even a servant; and can it be supposed it would not, on many occasions, have a similar effect, if twenty or thirty were present in the House of Commons?

With regard to the second. In the name of consistency and common sense, if the union of church and state be founded on unjust or irreligious principles, let it be fairly and openly abandoned, and let Pagan, Mahometan, and Roman Catholic, alike be eligible to legislation and to place; but if it be otherwise—if it be founded on wise and Scriptural principles, let those who advocate Catholic emancipation beware, how they break down the barriers of the constitution, and destroy its symmetry, for the purpose of trying unnecessary and unjustifiable experiments.

### O.

I take the liberty of remarking here, that it has occasionally impressed itself upon my mind, as a matter much to be regretted, that Governments in general, do not seem to feel the necessity of expostulating with the people in cases of public disturbance, before they resort to rigorous measures, in order to enforce a due observance of the laws. That the authority of the Government must be upheld by punishing transgressors, is true; also, that all due precaution should be used to guard against the consequences of riot or insubordination: but is it not possible that much good might be effected, if something of the same spirit of laudable diligence, which is used in raising police, preparing military and materials for war, were also used in circulating admonition and advice as extensively as possible, through the lower orders of the community? If short, well drawn up publications, suited to the capacity of the poor, were industriously spread over the country by means of our mail-coach establishments, parochial clergy, and every other channel that could be put in requisition for such a purpose? For my own part, I am much inclined to think, that all governments, founded in principles of religion and justice, are bound to try very active measures of this kind, in conjunction, or, as much as possible, previous to the force necessary for the punishment of offence; and that when the ruling power feels itself strong, there is too much tendency to

overlook this humane and important part of duty. It is well known, that affectionate expostulation and advice, often in private cases, prevents much calamity and unpleasantness; and if such means were more generally used in national ones, it is probable excesses might occasionally be prevented, which otherwise end in punishment and affliction. If such means were ever peculiarly necessary, they seem to be so with regard to this country at present. The poor in all places being the physical force, by which insurrectionary purposes are brought into action, in proportion to the quantum of ignorance which exists amongst them; in the same proportion will designing men work upon their minds; and in this view our peasantry, and a great majority of the working classes in Ireland, are so uninstructed, that they fall an easy prey to every factious or mischievous demagogue, who chooses to excite them to rebellion: and to this may be added, the slavish subjection they are under to their priests; a set of men, who for the most part, are neither *able* or *willing* to instruct them.

*Able*—Because their own education, and general habits of life, render them incompetent, and,

*Willing*—Because their system requires ignorance to work upon: and priests, who derive their chief income from the pockets of poverty and indigence, will not be disposed either too strongly to check the irregularities, or elevate in the intellectual scale, those on whom they, and perhaps a large portion of their families are depending for support.||

The system of expostulation here recommended might embrace a variety of subjects, such as—

|| If I may be allowed to add a Note to a Note, some persons have been of opinion, that the best means of remedying this latter evil would be, for the Government to make a stated provision for the priests, and render them in consequence independent of the people—but I earnestly hope, no consideration will ever induce the Government to adopt such a plan, it would be supporting a Satanic hierarchy in the country, and putting a liberal bounty on the maintenance of destructive error. Let the people be enlightened, and then, and then only, will the evils vanish.

The duty of the people with regard to their rulers, and upon what that duty rests.

The willingness of the Government, constitutionally to redress any grievances complained of.

The real causes of distress, and the evils of public disturbance.

That the poor who engage in insurrection, are only made the tools of wicked and designing men; and

That their condition and situation in life, preclude them from any rational hope of gaining by a change, while they suffer most in attempts to effect it.

Those, with many others, which might be useful and admit of much amplification, by getting into the hands and cottages of the poor, would gradually lead them to think and to judge for themselves.

Would in some degree counteract the injurious influence of a venal press.

Would present an obstacle to the exertions of the travelling incendiary.

Would weaken the disposition for hastily joining in unlawful associations;

And if it did not prevent many doing so, would at least produce two useful results. One, the certain tendency it would have for lessening the character of barbarism, which so often unhappily appears amongst the lower orders in Ireland; and the other, when severe measures became necessary, the satisfaction it would afford the government of the country; from a consciousness of having tried without effect, all possible means of expostulation and advice.

## P.

When it is stated in this division of the pamphlet, that the present insurrection in Ireland, as well as the disturbed state of other parts of Europe, proceed from the termination of the 1260 years allowed for the duration of popery; in order to

guard against some probable errors, and to ascertain as nearly as possible, what the Scripture representation of the subject is; I beg leave to go a little into it, arranging our view under the following heads.

*First, As to the most probable time when the period of the 1260 years commenced.*

*Secondly, As to the mark of its termination, and the events which will follow.*

*First, As to the most probable time when the period of the 1260 years commenced.*

Three periods have been mentioned as most generally looked to, A.D. 533, 606, and 755; many others might be brought forward,|| but I shall pass them over, as all cannot be noticed, and if one of the three selected, be attended with any tolerable degree of certainty, it involves every other in comparative error. Of those three, I look upon 533 to be much nearer the truth than 755—but there will not be the same difficulty in rejecting it, for an addition of 1260 to 533, brings the end to 1793, a period already 29 years past, and “the beast” still exists, and the marks forerunning his termination very imperfectly developed:—755 cannot be correct, and for the following reasons.

*First, Because those who adopt this opinion, seem chiefly to do so, from a supposition, that the pope could not be properly considered to commence his character of Antichrist, until, as Newton says, he became a “horn,” or temporal prince—but I cannot see what the circumstance of his being made a temporal prince, has to do with his being the head of the papal Antichristian power: for however temporal authority might be the means of making his Antichristian character more injurious, it don’t seem reasonable to suppose the one, in any way essential to the forma-*

---

|| One of which is Bishop Newton’s, who hesitates between four periods, from 737 to 787, but is disposed to adopt the first as most likely.

tion of the other, nor could it in any respect make him more "the man of sin" than before; and a horn in Scripture, perhaps more frequently applies to spiritual than to temporal power.

*Secondly*, Because such a calculation must either wholly disregard the present signs of the times, as they bear upon the existence of Antichrist, or put them into the unwarrantable length of 193 years operation, before they could produce any decisive change; 1260 and 755 making 2015, or 193 years from the present date.

*Thirdly*, Because in the Scriptures, Mohammedanism and popery seem invariably predicted as to rise and fall together; see Daniel viii. 9 to 14. xi. 40 to 45. Rev. x. 6. xi. 2. xi. 15 to 19. Now it is a remarkable fact, that in the same year, A.D. 606, Pope Boniface was made universal bishop, and Mohammed in a cave at Mecca invented his imposture;|| and if the period of 1260 years with regard to the former, be calculated from 755, it puts its termination 149 years beyond what may be reasonably looked to as the termination of the latter. It is difficult to account for, how persons of discernment in other respects, overlooked so important a circumstance as this; a circumstance which must put their mode of calculation entirely out of the question, and taken in connexion with the signs of the times just mentioned, gives no unreasonable ground for believing the duration of 1260 years to commence at a much earlier period, and that period, as far as human calculation can establish the point, I have no doubt is 606.

*First*, On account of the remarkable coincidence it furnishes, with respect to popery, and the imposture of Mahomet.

*Secondly*, Because in that year the pope, to all intents and purposes, became "the man of sin," ii. Thes. 2, 3.

*Thirdly*, Because 606 and 1260 added, make 1866, or 44 years

---

|| See any of the authors already referred to, particularly Faber on this place.

from our day, and judging from the ordinary progress of human events, that distance don't put the present signs of the times to an unreasonable length, even allowing the necessity of their going so far.

*Fourthly*, Because there is another period of 2300 days mentioned by Daniel, viii. 13, 14, at the expiration of which, from the time of the vision, it is said "the sanctuary should be cleansed," and any time fixed upon for the end of the 1260 days, should synchronise with this, in order to be correct. The 2300 days has been involved in considerable obscurity, owing to two causes; one is, the difficulty of ascertaining the time from which they should commence, and the other, from the circumstance of the Hebrew Scriptures, the Septuagint, and some copies mentioned by Jerome, varying with respect to the days. The first, as in our version, making it 2300 days; the second 2400; and the third 2200. With regard to the first cause of obscurity, it is lessened by the certainty that the commencement must be some time between A.C. 536, and A.C. 330,|| and this being the case, the period of 1866 will synchronise with the 2200, 2300, or 2400 days, which ever of them may be correct.

*Fifthly*, Because if we add to 1260 and 606, an additional period of 75 years mentioned by Daniel, xii. 11, 12. who evidently prophecied of the same events as John, it leads us to the year 1941, which considering the various opinions that exist with regard to the exact age of the world,† brings us nearly, perhaps precisely, to that of 6000, a time when the Christian church has long and almost universally supposed the Millenium or Sabbatical period of 1000 years will commence.

From all those circumstances, still bearing in mind the signs of the times, I have no hesitation in saying, that the termination of the period allowed for the duration of popery and Mahometanism is very near: 1866, or 44 years, is as far as the mind can

|| See Faber, &c.

† For information on this subject, see Encyclopædia Britannica, Helvicus's Chronological History.

with any propriety go—but whether it may not be shorter, might be questioned; particularly if the 1260 years be considered as lunar, which is far from improbable, or if any inaccuracy should exist in the common calculation of the Christian era, which was not made a period for noting time until some part of the sixth century. That it is shorter, perhaps considerably so, I would be much inclined to believe, resting at the same time a likelihood of the kind more upon some such circumstances as those, than upon any incorrectness in computing from the year 606.

The second division of the subject is—

*The mark of its termination, and the events which will follow.*

I say “mark” here, from a wish to confine this part of the subject to one particular circumstance, preferring on account of its importance, to keep it distinct, by classing what in some respects may be considered marks, with events following, rather than notice them under the separate term; and that mark I humbly conceive to be, **A PERSECUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.** Most persons whose minds have been enlightened with regard to popish error, whilst they lamented its prevalence, have at the same time supposed its *bad* days were over; and that its darkness would be gradually, and almost imperceptibly dissipated, by the increasing diffusion of religious light and knowledge—but this seems to have been a serious, and with reference to the conduct many in consequence have pursued, a very fatal mistake; and the reason which induces me to think so, is, a firm persuasion, that the “two witnesses” spoken of in the 11th chapter of Revelations, means nothing more or less than the Christian Church. After it is said “the outer court of the temple, and the holy city, should be trodden under-foot by the Gentiles, forty and two months,” the chapter proceeds to say, “*And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth.*”

I think this applies to the Christian Church.



*First*, From the utter impossibility that appears to have existed of finding any characters to whom the description of the witnesses would reasonably apply; which a reference to commentators on the subject will show, and it being expressly mentioned that the time they were to prophesy was to be 1260 years.

*Secondly*, From the great variety of places in Scripture, where the people of God are spoken of under the name of witnesses, and the message they receive from him to deliver, signified by the term of a testimony: see Mark xiii. 9. Acts x. 43. xxii. 43 and 48. 1 Cor. xv. 15. Hebrews xii. 1. and a number of other places too numerous to bring forward. Our Lord also, his people's representative head, was particularly promised and adverted to under the character of a witness, and afterwards spoke of himself in that capacity: "Behold, I have given him for a *witness* to the people." Isaiah lv. iv. "And from Jesus Christ, who is the *faithful witness*." Rev. 1. 5. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and *testify* what we have seen; and ye receive not our *witness*. And what he hath seen and heard, that he *testifieth*, and no man receiveth his *testimony*." John iii. 11 and 31.

*Thirdly*, Because the number two is frequently mentioned in Scripture, as necessary to render any testimony valid, John viii. 17. and its references; and in this sense, may with propriety be applied to the Church, bearing testimony as faithful and competent witnesses, against the corruptions of those, who just before were denominated "Gentiles," and who, it is said, would "tread underfoot the court of the temple, and the holy city, forty and two months."

*Fourthly*, Because the two witnesses mentioned here, are evidently referred to in the 20th of Rev. and 4th, where after the final destruction of "the beast and false prophet" have been described, and the second coming of Christ to reign a thousand years commences, it is said, "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the *witness of Jesus*, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image,

*neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."*

*Fifthly*, Because it is plainly mentioned who those witnesses are, "they are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks, standing before the God of the earth." Language nearly similar to this, is used at the commencement and conclusion of the 4th of Zechariah, which unquestionably has a spiritual reference to Christ, as the true olive tree and candlestick, standing before the God of the earth; but as he is represented by his church on earth, and exists amongst his believing people, they also may be called olive-trees and candlesticks; twofold, with respect to the sufficiency of their testimony, and "standing before the God of the earth," as relating to the faithfulness and perseverance with which they deliver it. Hence the people of God, both individually and collectively, as composing his church, are compared in the Bible to an olive-tree. *Individually*, the psalmist David says, "I am like a green *olive-tree* in the house of God." Psalm lli. 8. and *collectively*, "The Lord called thy name a green *olive-tree*, fair, and of goodly fruit." Jer. xi. 16. "His branches shall spread, and his beauty shall be as the *olive-tree*." Hosea xiv. 6. and again, in the 11th of Romans, the expression occurs several times, in a similar sense. A candlestick also is a very appropriate emblem of the church, as bearing and exhibiting the light and lustre of Christ, who is Himself "The true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." John i. 9. Hence it is regarded in the Bible in that view, which may be perceived from the directions with respect to it in the Jewish law, Exodus xxv. 31, &c. &c. and the way it is spoken of in Rev. i. 20. and ii. 5. Our Lord also seems to allude to the circumstance, when He tells his Disciples they "are the light of the world, and to let that light shine; for men when they light a candle, do not put it under a bushel, but on a *candlestick*, and it giveth light unto all that are in the house." Mat. v. 14 to 16.

*Sixthly*, Because in the very darkest ages of popish superstition, an examination into history will prove,, there never was wanting some witnesses, to raise their voice against its heresy

and abominable iniquity; and they may be justly said to have prophesied in sackcloth, when for upwards of nine hundred years the "gates of hell" seemed nearly to have prevailed against the church. There is something deeply melancholy in the expression "clothed in sackcloth," something one can better conceive than attempt to express, and even to the present day the fulfilment of the prophecy proceeds, for what reason has the Church of Christ to mourn on account of popery! and however we, owing to British liberty and protection, may speak with a little openness, how few parts of Europe are there, where the witnesses may not be considered as continuing to wear their sable clothing!

I am further strengthened in this view with respect to the witnesses, by the following description which succeeds respecting them: "*And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies; and if any man will hurt them, he must in this manner be killed. These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy; and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will.*" There is nothing in this language, but what is perfectly consistent with the power, the Scriptures say the people of God may have, and in some instances have had, through faith. "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and *nothing* shall be impossible unto you." Mat. xvii. 20. "And these signs shall follow them that believe, &c. they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them;" Mark xvi. 17 and 18. "Fire proceedeth out of the mouth of the witnesses" as from Elijah. 2 Kings i. 10. or Jeremiah v. 14. They have power to prevent rain as Elias; James v. 17. and over waters to turn them to blood; as Moses did, Exodus vii. 20. "If any man will hurt those witnesses, they shall in this manner be killed," by the fire just mentioned. If this be compared with the 19th Rev. and 20, the correspondence between the prediction and fulfilment will be perceived. Thus far and we are persuaded the more the subject is examined into, the more clearly it will appear, that the witnesses can mean nothing but the Christian Church. The chapter continues to say, "*when they shall have finished their testimony, the*"

P

beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. The finishing of the testimony here plainly alludes to the "forty and two months" mentioned in the second verse, which, as already remarked, was the time the witnesses were to prophesy; and that expired, the beast will make war against them, overcome, and kill them. It is probable the overthrow will be general and tyrannical, for it is said, "*their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified.*" In a variety of places in Scripture the worshipping church of God is compared to a city; particularly by the Old Testament prophets, and "the great city" mentioned here, in which the dead bodies of the witnesses shall lie, may be considered as referring to "the holy city" spoken of in the second verse, which was to be trodden under-foot, or the chief extent of Christendom, which, at the expiration of the forty and two months, on account of iniquity generally—but especially on account of the iniquity of slaying the witnesses; might be compared to Sodom and Egypt, where by provoking transgressions, our Lord was spiritually crucified. Heb. vi. 6. This overthrow, and barbarous treatment of the Christian church, will continue three years and an half, and will cause great rejoicings among the worshippers of the beast: "*And they of the people, and kindreds, and tongues, and nations, shall see their dead bodies three days and an half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves, and they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwell on the earth.*" "Tormented them," by the faithfulness and constancy of their testimony, they "loving darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." But when this three years and an half of bitter persecution is expired, then the beast will have done all he will be permitted to do; and the devil's last struggle for the preservation of his antichristian system will be at an end: "*and after three days and an half the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them which saw them.*" Then the results follow which we mentioned at the outset. Glorious things for God and his church, in quick and rapid succession, and all within the period of 75 years, already adverted to as mentioned by Daniel; the fulness of the Gentiles; the restoration of the

Jews ; a destruction of all external idolatry and antichristian heresy ; God's righteous indignation in the signal punishment of the "beast and false prophet ;" the binding of Satan ; and in conclusion, the first resurrection, and the second coming of Christ to reign a thousand years on the earth. In a hasty sketch of this kind, those events can be merely mentioned, but they are in the Bible, and may God enable us all to see them, and profit by the knowledge, to his praise and glory, through Christ the Lord.

As the subject of the persecution is what should chiefly concern Christians at present, I shall advert to it again ; making the following remarks :—

*First*, Whether it will partake of the dreadfully sanguinary character of former persecutions of the Church of Rome, or be principally confined to a general extinction of Christian liberty and freedom of worship, the event only will determine ; I should be much inclined to think, the language of Scripture is sufficiently strong, to justify an apprehension of the former. Such as "making war against, overcoming, and killing the witnesses, and letting their dead bodies lie in the street of the city, and not suffering them to be put in graves." Together with other parts of Scripture which might be referred to, descriptive of awful calamity, and plainly relating to this prophecy, and its attendant circumstances.

*Secondly*, Though I think there is little doubt, that the Gentiles, who it is said would tread under-foot the court of the temple, and the holy city, includes both Papists and Mahometans ; yet in the remainder of the chapter the former only seem to be adverted to as the persecuting power, particularly in the 9th verse "the kindreds and tongues and nations" mentioned there, being explained in the 15th verse of the 17th chapter with exclusive reference to Rome, under the expression of "the whore and mystical Babylon."

*Thirdly*, In further corroboration of our view with regard to the 11th of Revelations ; a reference to Daniel xi. 33—35, xii. 7 and 10 will show expressions relating to like events, and conveying a

similar import. The sentences "*when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, and many shall be purified, and made white and tried;*" are too plain to be mistaken, both as to order of time, and indication of suffering.

*Fourthly*, As I have no doubt these things rest upon such an unquestionable basis, that they will become increasingly clear and certain, to all Christian minds disposed to examine into the subject; I infer that the period of their fulfilment is not far distant: for in the course of God's providence, for wise ends, the meaning of most of his prophecies have been hidden from his people until the time of their fulfilment was at hand; and if Christians generally come to understand the 11th chapter of Revelations, as we have humbly endeavoured to view it here, it will be in some measure applicable to the remark: for hitherto commentators seem to have looked upon that chapter, as more inexplicable, than perhaps any other in New Testament prophecy. The time of its fulfilment is certainly not far distant; if we only look at the present state of things at home and abroad. The great antichristian powers of Mahometanism and Popery are all in motion: with respect to the former, the prophecy in the three concluding verses of the 11th of Daniel seems now to be in a course of remarkable fulfilment: "*tidings out of the east, and out of the north shall trouble him.*" Persia and Russia east and north are now in motion against Turkey, and troubling him. "*He shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Lybians and Ethiopians shall be at his steps.*" This is precisely the case, for we see Turkey now sending presents to those parts, and receiving promises of assistance both in men and money: "*therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly make away many.*" This we also see to be the case, and most likely the present motion of that power, will be attended with much slaughter; and that it will be, for the present, successful, the prophecy seems to predict: "*And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palaces between the seas in the glorious holy mountain:*" with great pride and haughtiness, on account of triumph: "*yet,*" it is said, "*he shall come to his end, and none shall help him;*" probably perish shortly afterwards at the same time as popery; in some signal way of judgment from God. If the former part of this be the case, it will be likely

so to occupy the Empéror Alexander, particularly with regard to the Gréeks; that Britain would be the only check the popish powers of Europe would have, were they to move in fulfilment of the 11th of Revelations; and it is remarkable, that she seems now to be on the verge of disqualifying herself from exercising that check, by admitting the worshippers of "the beast" into her legislative assemblies; worshippers our good forefathers shut out—but whom their degenerate sons are going to let in again.—A measure, that if it pass, England ere long will rue to her inmost soul.—A measure, that will set God and Britain at variance. Hitherto He has presided at her legislation, and she has prospered and grown great—but this measure carried and He is gone. "ICHABOD" may be written in characters of mourning over the nation, for her sons have gone contrary to God, by introducing into His presence, and clothing with honor, a system it was their duty to reprobate.—A system He deeply abhors, and has determined to curse.

Lest any persons might conceive this language unwarrantable, let them hear God speak for himself. "*The WATERS which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.* Rev. xvii. 15. *And the third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of WATERS; and they became blood. And I heard the angel of the WATERS say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because thou hast judged thus; for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy. And I heard another out of the altar say, Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments.*" Rev. xvi. 4 to 7.—"*And the fifth Angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; [Rome] and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sorés, and repented not of their deeds.*" Rev. xvi. 10, 11.

"*And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented*

*with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb : and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever : and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name."* Rev. xiv. 8 to 11. However terrifying this language may be, it is God's. He can neither do or say wrong, and "whoso hath ears to hear, let him hear."

In conclusion, as the chiefest of all sinners, and the least of all saints, I earnestly call upon the Church of God collectively, and every christian individually, to take these subjects into their serious consideration. If what we state from the eleventh of Revelations be true, is it not a solemn and an awful concern? A concern that effects no less than the life and the liberty of the christian church. How particularly, or when immediately, this event may take place, God only knows ; but that it is true, and things have begun to work for its accomplishment I most firmly believe. If christians upon a prayerful and minute examination, should be of the same opinion, I say to them. With you beloved friends, the matter chiefly rests. God is a God of infinite mercy. A God who delights in hearing and answering prayer, and who can tell, what prayer in this case may effect? If with reference to this prophesy, and in the exercise of faith, the supplication "spare thy people O Lord spare them," be earnestly, perseveringly, and affectionately offered up ; who I say can tell, what it may not accomplish? who can tell, but that God as a God of goodness and of love, may in tender compassion for his people avert the gathering cloud, letting only so many drops fall, as will evidence His faithfulness and His truth.

Yes christian, He is in a peculiar manner "the hearer and the answerer of prayer, and in such a case as this, it is the churches only reliance, and lest the enemy come upon it unawares, to that reliance I solemnly and humbly again direct its most diligent attention ; entreating, that the Father of lights may grant us grace, both from His mercies and His chastisements, to learn all He would have us to know, and be all he would have us to be, for Christ the Redeemer's sake. Amen.

FINIS.













